DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 461 JC 820 077

AUTHOR Heller, Barbara R.; And Others
TITLE Critical Characteristics of Incoming CUNY [City University of New York] Community College Freshmen: A Study of Characteristics of Enrollees and Nonenrollees.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Inst. for Research and Development in Occupational Education.
SPONS AGENCY New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Grants Administration.
REPORT NO CASE-03-81
PUB DATE Oct 81
GRANT VEA-80-3A-1037
NOTE 114p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Attendance; College Bound Students; College Choice; College Students; Community Colleges; Dropout Attitudes; Dropouts; Education Work Relationship; Enrollment Influences; Majors (Students); Noncollege Bound Students; Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; School Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; Student Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *No Shows

ABSTRACT

During 1979-80 a study was conducted to contrast the characteristics of new entrants to the City University of New York's (CUNY's) community college career programs with the characteristics of those who were accepted by CUNY institutions but who did not enroll. Separate questionnaires were sent to enrollees (N=4,246) and non-enrollees (N=2,503). Four analytical groups were identified among the survey respondents: CUNY community college enrollees (N=1,612); students attending other postsecondary institutions (N=263); admittees who had not attended school at all (N=182); and students who had begun at CUNY in Fall 1979 and had dropped out (N=94). The study report describes methodology and details findings in the areas of: (1) demographic variables (i.e., age, hours worked, family educational background, number of dependents, and mobility index); (2) academic characteristics; (3) non-academic characteristics (e.g., satisfaction with preparation for work and with counseling and high school activities); (4) extent of knowledge about the college's programs; (5) relation between education and jobs and salaries; (6) current attitudes toward school; (7) influences on choice of college and career programs; (8) first choice of college and program; and (9) discriminant analyses. Profiles are provided for each of the respondent groups, and the questionnaires are included. (KL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213461

CRITICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INCOMING CUNY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FRESHMEN: A STUDY OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ENROLLEES AND NONENROLLEES

BARBARA R. HELLER
FRED WHEELER
WENDY GERINGER

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
Center for Advanced Study in Education
The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CASE 03-81
OCTOBER 1981

THE STUDY REPORTED IN HEREIN WAS PERFORMED UNDER VEA No. 80-3A-1037GPS.

JC 820 077

The Institute is a component of the State Education Department's Research Coordinating Unit, a part of the Division of Occupational Education Planning and Information, Research, and Evaluation of the Office of Occupational and Continuing Education.

Funds for this project were provided under grant VEA #80-3A-1037 OPS through the Bureau of Grants Administration.

FOREWORD

The implementation of open admissions in 1970 and the growth of the City University of New York resulted in a dramatically large increase in the number of New York City residents applying to the colleges. For various reasons, and despite the introduction of tuition, applications continued to increase in many areas of the University. Included among these applicants, however, are a significant proportion who will not enroll in a CUNY college as scheduled. Based on several years' patterns, in any one year about 25 percent of the students who apply to the University and are accepted to some unit do not enroll in the allocated college.

With the changing college population, the centralization of the application and allotment procedures, and the tendency of high school students to apply to the CUNY colleges as a "back-up," it becomes critically important to be able to predict not only the proportion of "no-shows," but their characteristics as well.

The study reported herein is an attempt to delineate the characteristics that differentiate the enrollee from the non-enrollee, and should enable administrators and policy makers within and without the system to make predictions about the incoming first-year class in advance of registration. It is expected that this report will serve community college personnel throughout the State to better plan and assess the allocation and distribution of instructional and support services.

Lee Cohen, Ph.D.
Director, IRDOE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

From its inception, this project had the input of a great many people: we truly believe it benefitted as a result. Foremost, of course, we owe thanks to the interest of Lawrence E. Gray and the New York State Education Department's Bureau of Grants Administration, and of its Director, Mike Van Ryn. Their commitment to research translated into collegial--and actual--support.

Locally, Dr. Lee Cohen, Director of the Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education, and Dr. Alan Gartner, then Director of the Center for Advanced Study in Education, provided the backing so crucial to working through the myriad administrative details attendant to a project of this scope. On an everyday basis, they were assisted in these matters by Ruth Roman-Marrero, project secretary, and Melanie S. Bentley, executive assistant. Even such a team, however, could not have helped us complete our task were it not for the cooperation of the Graduate School and University Center's mailroom staff and the experts in the Computer Facility. Ms. Karen O'Brien typed the manuscript.

Among several other persons interested in this project, Dr. Barry Kaufman, University Associate Dean of Institutional Research, Dr. Dan J. Erlich, Director of the Office of Institutional Research at LaGuardia Community College, Mr. Les Jacobs, Director of CUNY's Office of Admission Services, and Dr. Alan Robertson, Chief of the Bureau of Occupational Educational Research of the State Education Department gave us valuable suggestions about the Survey instrument and study procedures. Lawrence Killian, a graduate student in CUNY's Educational Psychology program, drafted the early version of the questionnaires, which were more fully developed and assembled in final form by Karen Stekel, project associate.

Ms. Stekel, helped by Sui Kwan Cheng and Arlene Vogl, both project assistants, and by Madeline Bosky, took care of the initial administration of the Survey and of the followup administrations, including the training of telephone callers and of the phoning itself.

The completed questionnaires were coded by still another team that included Ms. Stekel, Cheng, Vogl, and Bosky under the supervision of Dr. Rita Senf. Dr. Senf was responsible for the coding scheme that left our data relatively free from ambiguity. Dr. Senf and Fred Wheeler started the

analysis of the data, which he and Ms. Vogl completed.

Original drafts of this report were written by Mr. Wheeler. Subsequent revisions were undertaken by Carla Collins, a CUNY graduate student in CUNY's Social Personality Psychology program, and by Wendy Geringer, staff associate. The final version, largely a result of Ms. Geringer's effort, remains, however, the sole responsibility of the project director.

This project was a complex undertaking and we were fortunate enough to have expert help at each stage. Although ostensibly self evident, the few "simple truths" we found about CUNY enrollees, and about the other analytic groups, should provide impetus for self examination and hopefully, for new insights about the populations we are reaching as well as those that we do not yet attract.

Barbara R. Heller

Barbara R. Heller
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
BACKGROUND	1
METHODOLOGY	5
STUDENT SAMPLE	5
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	6
ADMINISTRATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE	7
RETURN RATE	9
DATA ANALYSIS	10
Coding questionnaire returns	10
Creation of master file	11
Statistical analyses	11
DESCRIPTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS	11
MAJOR ANALYTIC GROUPS	12
RESULTS	14
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES	15
Age	15
Hours worked per week	17
History of family college attendance	18
Number of dependents	18
Mobility index	18
ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS	19
College admission average	20
English high school average	21
Math high school average	21
Science high school average	21
Type of high school/diploma	22
NONACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS	22
Satisfaction with preparation for work	25
Satisfaction with high school counseling	25
Social club membership	25
Job placement office	26
Volunteer work	26
Afterschool and/or summer jobs	26
PSAT/SAT tests	26
The high school activity index	26

	Page
COLLEGE INFORMATION	27
Knowledge of liberal arts vs. career programs	28
Knowledge of SUNY/CUNY differences	28
Knowledge of associate/bachelor's degree	28
Needed remedial help	29
Expected remedial assignment(s)	30
REASONS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE	30
Influence of high school teacher	32
College's reputation	34
"Own interests"	34
Marriage	34
Time-off	35
Working full time	35
CUNY four-year college	35
Non-CUNY four-year college	35
CUNY two-year college	35
Trade or technical school	35
Good job placement office	36
Caring college personnel	36
Formal degree program	36
Other schools require more work	36
Not having good enough grades	36
Easier courses	37
Tuition at other schools	37
Work	37
Convenient location	37
Friends went there	37
RELATION BETWEEN EDUCATION AND JOBS AND SALARIES	38
Good jobs with a four-year degree	38
Good jobs with an advanced degree	41
Good jobs with a professional degree	41
High salary with a GED	41
High salary with a high school diploma	41
High salary with an advanced degree	41
CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL	42
Expected level of education	42
Family expectations: education	42
Likelihood of completing desired level of schooling	42
Probability of interrupted education	43
Likelihood of a job in chosen career field	43
Dissatisfaction index	43
Satisfaction with school	46
Satisfaction with education	46
Satisfaction with major/curricular program	46
Satisfaction with career goals	46
Satisfaction with decision to continue school	46

	Page
CHOICE OF COLLEGE AND CAREER PROGRAM.....	47
CUNY career program as first-choice program.....	47
Accounting programs.....	50
Business-related programs.....	50
Health-related programs.....	50
Data-processing programs.....	50
CUNY career program matches first-choice career.....	50
First-choice college is a two-year college.....	50
College location: Queens.....	51
College location: Brooklyn.....	51
COLLEGE AND PROGRAM ALLOCATION.....	51
Financial aid.....	54
Allocated to first-choice curriculum.....	54
Curriculum related to career goal.....	54
Allocated to remedial courses.....	54
Accounting.....	56
Business-related curricula.....	56
Health-related curricula.....	56
Advertising curricula.....	56
DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES.....	57
Preliminary analyses, variables by category.....	58
Final Discriminant Analyses.....	59
DISCUSSION.....	72
PREDICTING ENROLLMENT.....	72
CUNY (COMMUNITY COLLEGE) ATTENDER GROUP PROFILE.....	75
NON-CUNY ATTENDER GROUP PROFILE.....	76
DROPOUT GROUP PROFILE.....	79
NEVER-IN-SCHOOL GROUP PROFILE.....	81
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	83
In-school groups.....	86
Groups not (currently) in schools.....	88

0 9

LIST OF TABLES

No.		Page
1	Number and Proportion of Students in the Sample Who Responded to Each Administration of the Survey Questionnaire	8
2	Enrollment Status by Analytic Group.....	13
3	A Listing of Demographic Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence.....	16
4	Demographic Characteristics: Mean Scores on Selected Demographic Variables for Each Analytic Group.....	17
5	A Listing of Academic Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence.....	19
6	Academic Characteristics: Mean Scores on Selected High School Academic Variables for Each Analytic Group.....	20
7	A Listing of Nonacademic Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence.....	23
8	Nonacademic Characteristics: Mean Scores on Selected High School Experience (Nonacademic) Variables for Each Analytic Group.....	24
9	A Listing of College Information Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence.....	27
10	College Information: Mean Scores on Selected College Information Variables for Each Analytic Group.....	29
11	Influences on Current & Future activities: A Listing of Variables, Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence.....	30, 31
12	Reasons for Attending College: Mean Scores on Selected Variables Relating to Choice of Schooling for Each Analytic Group.....	32, 33

No.		Page
13	A Listing of Variables Relating Education to Jobs and Salaries: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence	39
14	Relation between Education and Jobs and Salary: Mean Scores on Variables Relating Educational Attainment to Jobs and Salary for Each Analytic Group	40
15	A Listing of Variables Relating to Current Attitudes Toward Schooling: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence	43
16	Current Attitudes Toward Schooling: Mean Scores on Expectations About and Satisfaction with Schooling	44
17	A Listing of Variables Relating to Choice of College and Program: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence	48
18	College and Career Programs: Proportion of Students in Each Analytic Group Selecting Specific College- and Career-Related Variables as First Choice	49
19	A Listing of Variables Relating to College and Program Allocation: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence	52, 53
20	College and Program Allocation: Proportion of Students in Each Analytic Group Who Were Allocated to Selected Colleges and Programs of First Choice	55
21	Summary of Study Variables	60-63
22	Variables and Order of Entry for Final Discriminant Analysis	65
23	Summary Statistics for Final Discriminant Analysis	66
24	Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Each Variable on Each of Three Functions	67

CRITICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INCOMING CUNY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FRESHMEN

In 1979-80, the CASE Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education (IRDOE) conducted a study to examine the characteristics of who, from among all applicants, actually enrolls in community college career programs.[1] This report summarizes the results of this research and seeks to provide City University of New York (CUNY) administrators with more detailed information about the composition of the class of incoming first-time students, and knowledge of how these enrollees differ from accepted applicants who do not attend. Further, it attempts to identify variables which would predict the enrollment patterns of all applicants in advance of registration.

BACKGROUND

During the last two decades there has been growth and development at the two-year college level nationwide. The vitality of this movement is also reflected in CUNY's community colleges as both an increase in enrollment and in the number of two-year units comprising the system: from 1964 to 1968, for example, enrollments increased by 15 percent, while from 1968 to 1973 (covering the advent of open admissions and the addition of three new colleges to the system) there was a 196 percent increase in the number of full-time day matriculants. There has also been an increase in the number of new entrants, from 22,678 in 1972 to 27,373 in 1978.

This trend is not likely to continue. To the contrary, there has recently been a leveling off, and the predicted decline in college enrollments nationally is expected locally as well. Along with decreasing enrollments, there exists the need to curtail or streamline services (instructional and support) to compensate for the cutbacks in funding and staffing experienced by many public institutions in recent years. To respond wisely to these changes, policy makers at many levels, both within and outside the CUNY system,

[1] VEA #80-3A-1037 GPS

need access to adequate data concerning the characteristics (needs) of the students they may attract.

The community colleges have demonstrated a responsiveness and a commitment to their role in educating unusually diverse and fast-changing student populations. There is evidence, for example, that among new CUNY community college enrollees are a growing number of students who are considerably different from their cohorts of only ten years ago: this new freshman has a more varied background, may not be a recent high school graduate, takes longer to complete the two-year program, and intends to continue his/her education beyond the associate degree level.[1] Furthermore, these matriculants are increasingly older and more likely to be female. A substantial number of these so-called nontraditional students have had prior work experience and are using their community college education to acquire formal requisite credentials for promotion or advancement in their career field. While the community colleges can and do adapt to the needs of new groups of students, they can be effective only to the extent that these needs are known to them.

Under the open enrollment admissions policy, all City residents with a high school diploma or equivalent are guaranteed admission to one of the units of the City University of New York: open admissions has thus swelled the potential college population and, as a result, each year the University processes applications from approximately 50-60,000 persons. However, the available information indicates that only about three-fourths of eligible applicants show up for fall registration. Who are these students and what are their needs are important questions that affect the allocation of services, the scheduling of classes, and the distribution of personnel and nonpersonnel resources. Another related question is who are those students who do <u>not</u> enroll, and could they benefit from attendance? Focused answers to these and similar questions permit better directed outreach and recruitment efforts and targeted instructional and supplementary activities.

Before proceeding, we feel it would be helpful to briefly review the CUNY centralized application process under open admissions. The University's Office of

---

[1] Heller, B.R., F. Wheeler, and L. Gross. <u>1973 Career Graduates: A Profile of CUNY Community College Students</u>, Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York, CASE #26-78, September 1978. ED No. 161 470; VEA #CO77-2-904.

Admission Services (OAS) provides a standard form (with variations for foreign students, transfer students, and those students interested in special programs such as College Discovery and SEEK) for applicants to all CUNY college units or programs. This application form, made available to secondary level seniors through the City's high schools and to all other applicants through OAS' offices, includes an official high school transcript and some other basic demographic data including date of birth, sex, family income, and so on. Using this form, the applicant lists the six colleges (two- and four-year) and corresponding programs of study (majors, curricula) she/he is interested in, paired, and in order of priority. Allocations to the college unit+specific program are done centrally by OAS in the spring prior to the September date of entry, and every effort is made to grant applicants their first choice(s).

High school average determines first, whether the applicant is allocated to a four-year senior college or to a two-year community college: again to the extent possible, consideration is given to the applicant's priorities, and OAS estimates that well over 9 out of ten applicants are allocated to the college of their first choice. Unless a specific program is not offered by a particular college, it is usual for applicants to opt for a college in their borough of residence. High school average also determines eligibility to a program of study, but there are only a very few community college programs that set higher-than-usual grade requirements.

Once allocations are made and the applicant notified, it remains only for him/her to take "placement tests" (in reading, writing, and mathematics) to determine minimal competency and need for remediation, and to register for courses. Allocants are not required to file formal acceptances of their intent to enroll. Thus, actual counts of the size or estimates of the composition of the incoming class derive from September registration figures. The discrepancy between the number of allocants and the number of enrollees (i.e., registrants) can be attributed in large part to two factors: (1) a modest application fee and no admissions requirements (e.g., the S.A.T. is not required) other than high school graduation (or its equivalent) and residency in New York City and, (2) the resultant and related common practice whereby City high school personnel encourage all graduating seniors to apply to CUNY—whether as a real choice, as a back-up in case of rejection by other schools, or to keep open options for students undecided about their future course of action.

While the CUNY student may have desired a college education (although not

necessarily at the City University of New York, nor at the particular college to which he/she is allocated), as a group the non-enrollee can be presumed to be even more diverse, consisting of students who enroll in other colleges or training institutions and applicants who selected options other than education, including the Armed Services, full-time employment, and "some time off" for family or personal reasons.

Data about the composition of the community college population have come largely from two sources: systematically conducted institutional counts, a census, and studies of other issues that incidentally describe population characteristics. Both provide data about the student in college, after enrollment. Little data exists about how students who will actually enroll differ from those who are accepted but who will not show up for registration. The study described herein focuses on delineating the salient characteristics of students who enrolled in CUNY community college career programs in the Fall of 1979; the methodology we employed also permits us to describe accepted applicants who did not register. These non-enrollees are a substantially large group as we pointed out, accounting for approximately 25 percent of all applicants each year, and, furthermore, represent a population that may include learners whom the community colleges could well serve.

In designing the research, we envisioned two major uses of the results: program planning and recruitment. First, by adding to the CUNY application a series of items which predict which types of applicants will enroll, administrators could obtain a more accurate estimate and description of a future incoming class at the time of allocation. This would, of course, help in planning for an upcoming year. Second, recruitment efforts would be aided by a better understanding of the characteristics of students who choose not to enroll in CUNY community college career programs. Modified recruitment strategies or different on-campus offerings or support services might be forthcoming based on the characteristics of the current group of "no-shows." With these purposes in mind, the primary objectives of this study were to:

- describe the characteristics--demographic, motivational, and experiential--that distinguish the career program enrollee from the "no-show" or non-enrollee;
- present a composite profile of the groups as a basis for planning services for the new entrant and for attracting the non-enrollee; and
- develop key questionnaire items that distinguish between the two major groups of applicants and that could be incorporated into the CUNY application process.

METHODOLOGY

The present research focuses on students accepted into the CUNY community colleges' career programs for the Fall of 1979. As such it allows for (1) a comparison between that group of students and those from previous years--which should further understanding of the changing composition of the community college population; and (2) a contrast between enrollees and non-enrollees, which should provide administrators a more detailed, current information base for institutional planning.

To maximize comparisons with similar groups of students, this investigation incorporated procedures and questionnaire items the authors developed for the Followup Survey of CUNY Graduates.[1] In addition to providing a basis of comparability, the methodology for the 1973 Career Graduates project was effective and was adapted to the present study. It was necessary, of course, to identify a new sample, develop a new survey instrument, and obtain the consent of the CUNY community colleges so that they would provide us with student names and current addresses.

STUDENT SAMPLE

Since our primary purpose was to contrast CUNY enrollees and non-enrollees, the sample of allocants had to be drawn so that it was not only representative of the population of allocants-at-large, but also composed of a large enough number of non-enrollees to make confident statistical comparisons. A random sample of approximately 7,000 students was drawn by social security number, comprising one out of every four persons allocated to community college career programs in the Fall 1979.[2] This sample was selected after we merged the COLLAD tape, (which consists of all individuals' application information plus allocation outcomes) with registration data (SHOW-

---

[1] 1973 Career Graduates, op. cit.

[2] We wish to acknowledge the interest and cooperation of the Office of the University Dean of Institutional Research for guiding and assisting us in this task.

REGISTRATION tapes compiled at the time of registration and subsequently submitted to CUNY's central Office of Institutional Research and Analysis).[1] The merged tape from which our sample was drawn thus included the enrollment status for the entire population of allocants.[2] From this population, we prepared a new tape consisting of only sample students to which was added new, temporary I.D. numbers for this study. Data for our sample was selectively copied from the master tape; we did not duplicate all of the COLLAD and SHOW-REG information. Our tape contained some personal and demographic data; high school grades, courses, and averages; allocated college, curriculum, and session; first-choice college, curriculum, and session; and first-semester courses, grades, and number of credits.

The final sample consisted of 6,749 allocants (plus 58 non-usable students allocated to Hostos Community College), of whom 4,246 were designated by the colleges as enrollees and 2,503 as non-enrollees (i.e., no shows).

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Development of the survey instrument(s) started early in the project year and, in addition to senior project staff, involved input from other specialists.[3] The questionnaire was designed to supplement the other already available information (from the COLLAD and SHOW-REG tapes), and contained items pertaining to the students' educational history, career plans, and current schooling and work activities. There were also some demographic questions about family background and financial aid. Two slightly different

---

[1] The COLLAD tape is prepared by OAS' UAPC (University Application Processing Center) and consists of information from the CUNY application form and high school transcript, supplemented with other data (e.g., high school academic average) derived from these. SHOW-REG(istration) tapes, on the other hand, are generated by each CUNY college and consist of such things as enrollment information plus a listing of courses for which the students registered.

[2] Although each college is to submit its SHOW-REG tape as soon after registration as possible, and we delayed selection of the sample to permit them to do so, by January the SHOW-REG tape for Hostos Community College was still not available. Therefore, this investigation does not include data from this institution.

[3] We would like to acknowledge the advice of the Colleges' Directors of Institutional Research and in particular that of the (then) Director at LaGuardia Community College.

versions of the questionnaire were prepared, one for enrollees ("Survey of Community College Freshmen"--30 questions) and one for non-enrollees ("Survey of Recent High School Graduates"--31 questions), as these groups were defined by the SHOW-REG data. A copy of each 6-page instrument is appended. (See Appendix A.)

The intent of two versions was to simplify data analysis and to focus more specifically on items that might differentiate between the two groups; this proved cumbersome and confusing. Any replication of this study would benefit from using one instrument.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaires were mailed between January 22 and January 31, 1980. It should be noted that by this date, students had not only decided whether or not to enroll in college, but had about four to five months of subsequent experiences related to their decisions. Those who were in school were nearing the conclusion of their first semester; those who decided not to continue their education were engaged in other pursuits. Whereas the timing of the data collection was not important with respect to many of the study's variables (e.g., sex, family college history, use of high school placement office or counseling services), it presented a problem in the interpretation of other information (e.g, current work status, level of dissatisfaction, level of knowledge about community college career programs). Given the amount of time necessary to develop the questionnaire(s), obtain mailing lists, and assemble the mailing, it was not possible to administer the questionnaires earlier. We will indicate in our discussion of the results where we feel the timing substantially affects the interpretation of the data.

Accompanying a questionnaire with pre-printed project I.D. number, each student in the sample also received an addressed, prepaid return envelope and a letter describing the purpose of the study and outlining the procedures. As can be seen in Table 1, page 8, a total of 1434 students--about 21 percent of the total sample--responded to the first mailing, almost all of whom did so well before the cutoff date.[1]

---

[1]We set up a procedure by which we could determine whether questionnaires received after the first cut-off date were late returns to the first mailing or in response to the followup we undertook: for the followup, I.D. numbers were written by hand, easily differentiable from the printed number on the questionnaire administered initially.

Table 1

Number and Proportion of Students in the Sample Who Responded to Each Administration of the Survey Questionnaire

Respondents/Sample	ENROLLEES	NON-ENROLLEES	TOTAL SAMPLE
N, Corrected Sample	4246	2503	6749
N sent First Mailing (inc. Hostos)	4258	2549	6807
N Returns	1060	374	1434
% Returns	24.9	14.7	21.1
N sent Second Mailing[a]	2129	1273	3404
N Returns	293	122	415
% Returns	13.8	9.6	12.2
N possible phone numbers	529	345	874
N phone calls completed[b]	425	276	701
N Returns[c]	209	109	318
% Returns	49.2	39.5	45.4
TOTAL Returns (inc. Hostos)	1562	605	2167
N Corrected Total Returns (Respondents in Sample)	1557	594	2151
% Corrected Total Returns	36.7	23.7	31.9

[a] Does not include mail not delivered--returned to sender; address unknown (822 enrollees; 173 non-enrollees.)

[b] Includes only contacts made; does not include changed, disconnected, unlisted numbers, or no answers after a 5 day/night period of attempted calls.

[c] Includes returns gathered by phone and by mail subsequent to the phone contact.

Prior research suggested that a higher rate of return results from a telephone followup of nonrespondents rather than from a second mailing. To test this, we randomly assigned nonrespondents to two groups, one of whom we proposed to telephone and the other of whom we would mail a second questionnaire. Because we could locate phone numbers for only a possible 874 nonrespondents in total, the second questionnaire was mailed to all others for whom addresses were current (i.e., except for those marked "returned to sender" or "addressee unknown").

A new cover letter was written for the followup mailing which was sent out by April 1, 1980. As before, the recipient received a copy of the questionnaire and a prepaid, addressed return envelope. All responses received by August 8, the extended cut-off date, were considered in the analyses; an additional 415 students responded (see Table 1).

As anticipated, the telephone followup procedure resulted in a better response rate. Of the 874 possible numbers, we made contact with the student, a relative, or a household member in 701 instances. (The remainder included cases of "student unknown" and "incomplete" calls, so defined when there was no response after five days'/nights' attempts.)

Each caller, specially trained for the task, was directed to elicit responses to the questionnaire by phone or, if the student was unwilling or unavailable to do so then, urge that the "second" questionnaire (which the caller immediately numbered and addressed) be completed and returned to us. A total of 318 students responded (45% of the 701 contacts), 169 on the phone and 149 who, as a result of the call, completed a questionnaire. This 45 percent is a far higher rate than either the first or the second mailing (unaccompanied by a telephone call) elicited, and confirms our hypothesis and the findings of other researchers that suggest that the more personalized the contact, the better the rate of return.

RETURN RATE

Table 1, page 8, summarizes these data. The overall rate of return for the total sample is 32 percent, with a substantially greater proportion of enrollees than non-enrollees responding. As can also be readily seen, the response resulting from telephone calls was dramatic for a survey of this kind: almost half the enrollees and 40 percent of non-enrollees responded positively to the phone calls, in very marked contrast to that responding to either the first or second mailed questionnaire alone.

Enrollees comprised about 63 percent of the original sample, but 72 percent of the total respondents. Thus in terms of all subsequent analyses, it is important to remember that this group is slightly overrepresented. The greater interest of CUNY students to a CUNY-presented study is not surprising, however, and in and of itself can be interpreted as concern for their education and the colleges they are attending.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis involved several phases and included creating a tape based on COLLAD and SHOW-REG data for all students in the sample, coding questionnaire responses and adding these data (for respondents only) to the tape, transferring all information to disk, and computing preliminary analyses of the variables and the final, discriminant analyses. Documentation concerning these steps is available for inspection in IRDOE's offices.

Coding questionnaire returns. Ambiguities in some items and contradictory responses between others, as well as discrepencies between questionnaire responses and information on the COLLAD and SHOW-REG tapes necessitated coding each return twice before the data were keypunched, verified, and transferred to disk. A coding manual was developed and was used to resolve most contradictions.

Probably no one judgment was as difficult to make as determining whether the respondent was or was not enrolled in a CUNY community college, and whether she/he had been enrolled during the Fall semester.[1] For example, the COLLAD data might indicate that student A was allocated to college Y, while the SHOW-REG data from college Y showed that Student A had not registered. Student A, on the other hand, responded that he was attending college X, another, different CUNY two-year school. (Student A might also indicate he was enrolled in a non-CUNY postsecondary institution, and for non-enrollees, this is, of course, an anticipated occurence since by definition a non-enrollee is a student not enrolled in a CUNY community college.) For respondents,

---

[1] As noted, the questionnaire(s) was administered during the Spring semester and many respondents apparently had difficulty with questions such as "Are you currently [between 9/79 and now] enrolled..?" Their responses, moreover, were often difficult to reconcile with enrollment status as defined by the colleges' SHOW-REG data.

we used the questionnaire data; in the other instances, we used the COLLAD college of allocation.

Creation of the master file. Once the returns were checked, and preliminary statistical comparisons done, the data was merged with the data from the COLLAD and SHOW-REG tapes. Subsequently, all information was put on disk for further analyses and storage. For all 6749 students in the sample, the master file contains application and high school transcript information (from OAS' COLLAD tape), and enrollment status (from the colleges' SHOW-REG tapes with corrections from Survey respondents' self-reports). For the 2151 respondents to the Survey, the file also contains questionnaire data.

Statistical analyses. Analysis of those variables based on data derived from the COLLAD on SHOW-REG tapes were done considering all 6749 students in the sample; where questionnaire data were analyzed, obviously only the respondent group could be considered. Preliminary analyses included frequencies and cross-tabulations of the variables and, as appropriate, analyses of variance, t-tests, and chi squares. Also used was linear discriminant analysis--a technique that classifies groups along a number of different variables (i.e., characteristics), and that enables us to distinguish students who enrolled in the CUNY community colleges from those students who did not enroll or who enrolled elsewhere. The SPSS Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was selected for use, since it provides the best combination of flexibility in analysis and clarity of output format.

DESCRIPTION OF QUESTIONNNAIRE RESPONDENTS

As noted, approximately one-third (32%) of the sample responded to the questionnaire. There appeared to be a number of differences between this group and the total. As compared with the sample, the respondent group was:

- younger (63% of the sample vs. 71% of the respondents were age 20 or less);
- more recently graduated from high school (78% of the sample vs. 83% of the respondents were graduated from high school in 1978 or thereafter);
- somewhat overrepresented in terms of the proportion having enrolled in the CUNY community college to which they were allocated;
- more likely to be female (56% sample vs. 60% respondent group), which is not

surprising since women comprise a greater proportion of enrollees;

- more likely to score at 75 or higher on the college admissions tests (35% sample vs. 42% respondents);
- more likely to rank as college of their first choice, and to be allocated to, Queensborough, Kingsborough, and LaGuardia Community Colleges; and
- less likely to rank as their first-choice-college, and to be allocated to, Borough of Manhattan and New York City Community Colleges.

There was little or no difference between the respondents and the sample with respect to:

- type of high school certification; citizenship status; handicapping conditions (based on Health Alert reports); allocation to special programs, such as SEEK and College Discovery; (first) choice of a career or transfer program; (first) choice of a two- or four-year college; the proportion allocated to the college of their first choice; or in the proportion failing the reading, writing, and/or math skills assessment tests.

MAJOR ANALYTIC GROUPS

Table 2, on the following page, compares respondents' self-reported enrollment status with similar information from the CUNY SHOW-REG tapes. As can be seen, there are some discrepancies. About 96 percent of the 1557 respondents reported by the individual community colleges as having enrolled indicated that they were in fact in attendance at that college. In comparison, only approximately 81 percent of the CUNY-designated non-enrollees were correctly classified--the remaining 19 percent reported that they were indeed attending a CUNY community college. Most of the discrepancy comes about from the fact that CUNY enrollment data are reported by the individual college, so if a student enrolls in a CUNY college other than the one to which he/she is allocated, this may not be recorded. <u>All further analyses of respondents will be based on self-reported enrollment status</u>.

Students classified as non-enrollees fall into three distinct categories. The largest group, about 12 percent of all respondents, did not enroll in a CUNY community college but did attend other postsecondary institutions. The remaining non-enrollees either did not start any educational program since applying to CUNY, or enrolled in a postsecondary

TABLE 2

Enrollment Status by Analytic Group

School Attended: Self-Reports	CUNY-Designated: ENROLLEES N	(%)	NON-ENROLLEES N	(%)	ANALYTIC GROUPS N	(%)
CUNY Community College	1497	(96.1)	115	(19.4)	1612	(74.9)
Other college/school:	13	(0.8)	250	(42.1)	263	(12.2)
SUNY two-year	0	-	33	(5.6)	33	
Other two-year	0	-	8	(1.3)	8	
CUNY four-year	5	(0.3)	38	(6.4)	43	
SUNY four-year	0	-	16	(2.7)	16	
Other four-year	1	(0.1)	91	(15.3)	92	
Trade/Technical	6	(0.4)	54	(9.1)	60	
Other; misc.	1	(0.1)	10	(1.7)	11	
Dropped Out	38	(2.4)	56	(9.4)	94	(4.4)
Never-in-school	9	(0.6)	173	(29.1)	182	(8.5)
TOTALS	1557	(72.4)	594	(27.6)	2151	(100.0)

program but dropped out within one semester. For purposes of analysis, these groups were treated separately. Therefore, four major analytic divisions emerge, which are defined below:

- CUNY community college enrollees include all respondents[1] who indicated they attend a CUNY community college. This was by far the largest group, accounting for 74.9 percent of all respondents. Hereafter, this group is referred to as "CUNY attenders."

---

[1] Non-respondents are classified into enrollee or non-enrollee groups on the basis of CUNY (SHOW-REG) designations.

- Enrollees, non-CUNY community college ("non-CUNY (school) attenders") include respondents attending any type of postsecondary institution other than CUNY two-year colleges. This group accounts for 12.2 percent of all respondents. The institutions these students attend vary (see Table 2, page 13), and include CUNY, SUNY, and private four-year colleges as well as trade and technical schools. While it would have been desirable to keep these sub-groupings separate, the Ns were too small to permit us to do so.
- Non-currently-in-school (hereafter, "Dropouts", 4.4% of the respondents) includes all respondents who gave some indication of having started school but who had dropped out by the Spring semester of the 1979-80 academic year when the questionnaire was administered; and the
- Never-in-school group (8.5% of the respondents) that includes those students who reported not having enrolled in any type of schooling after high school graduation.

The next section summarizes the major findings with respect to the four analytic groups. The data were not analyzed on a college-by-college basis, but are arranged in a manner that such analyses would be possible.

RESULTS

In this section we will first compare the four groups--CUNY attender, Non-CUNY attender, Dropout, and Never-in-school--using information from the CUNY application form (COLLAD data source) and from the questionnaire (Survey). Next, we will present the results of the discriminant analysis which uses selected variables in an attempt to predict group membership--that is, to predict who will enroll in a CUNY community college and who will fall in each of the other three non-attender classifications.

For ease of discussion, the groups will be examined on all the variables categorized into nine sections or sets: (1) DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES; (2) ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS; (3) NONACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS; (4) COLLEGE INFORMATION; (5) REASONS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE; (6) RELATION BETWEEN

EDUCATION AND JOBS AND SALARY; (7) CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOLING; (8) CHOICE OF COLLEGE AND CAREER PROGRAMS; and (9) COLLEGE AND PROGRAM ALLOCATION. Each of these nine sets of variables will be presented sequentially and follow a similar format. First, we will list the variables (and data source) comprising the category in a summary table that also notes which groups the variables discriminated among, and at what levels of statistical significance. Nonsignificant variables will be listed first, followed by those with a significance level of $\leq .05$ and $\leq .01$. Variables that seem to hold most promise as predictors or those on which the groups differ dramatically (denoted by * in the summary table) are identified, and selected ones briefly described.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Table 3 on the following page summarizes the variables classified as DEMOGRAPHIC. Many of these variables from the standard CUNY application form yielded no statistical differences among the analytic groups: specifically--SEX of the respondent, HANDICAPPING CONDITION (as measured by whether the CUNY application is flagged with a HEALTH ALERT), and CITIZENSHIP STATUS. Other items from the Survey were similarly not significant: TRAVEL TIME TO SCHOOL, COST OF TRAVEL TO SCHOOL, WHY RESPONDENT WORKS, WHETHER PRESENT JOB IS RELATED TO (the Respondents') CAREER CHOICE, and WHETHER PRESENT JOB IS RELATED TO (his/her) SCHOOL PROGRAM.

A discussion of five of the significant variables, listed in Table 4, page 17, with group means and standard deviations, follows. These variables were singled out because they best differentiated the groups.

Age. Respondents' AGE differentiates between all analytic groups, except CUNY attenders from those persons who reported they were Never-in-school (after high school completion). As can be seen in Table 4, the CUNY attender and the Never-in-school groups are approximately the same age, although the range (standard deviation, S.D.) is greater for the students attending CUNY community colleges. Dropouts are the oldest group on the average (23.0 years old), and students attending non-CUNY schools the youngest (19.0 years).

TABLE 3

A Listing of Demographic Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE
NS	Sex	Survey
NS	Health Alert (handicapping condition) Status	COLLAD
NS	Citizenship Status	COLLAD
NS	Travel Time to School	Survey
NS	Cost of Travel to School	Survey
NS	Why Respondent Works	Survey
NS	Present Job Related to Career Choice	Survey
NS	Present Job Related to School Program	Survey
$\chi^2 \leq .05$	Work Experience Related to Career Choice	Survey
$\chi^2 \leq .05$	Where Lived During High School (location variable)	Survey
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Date of High School Graduation	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .01$	*Age:	Survey;
$t \leq .05$	CUNY vs. Non-CUNY, Dropouts;	grouped data
$t \leq .05$	Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school;	
$t \leq .05$	Dropouts vs. Never-in-school	
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Currently Working Full Time/Part Time	Survey; grouped data
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Currently Working/Not Working	
ANOVA $\leq .01$	*Hours Worked Per Week/Not Working	Survey;
$t \leq .01$	CUNY vs. Never-in-school, Dropouts;	raw data
$t \leq .01$	Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school, Dropouts	
ANOVA $\leq .01$	*Family College History:	Survey;
$t \leq .01$	CUNY vs. Never-in-school;	grouped data
$t \leq .01$	Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	
ANOVA $\leq .01$	*Number of Financial Dependents:	Survey
$t \leq .01$	CUNY vs. Non-CUNY, Dropouts;	
$t \leq .01$	Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Marital Status	Survey
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Who Respondent Lives With	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$	*Mobility Index	Survey;
$t \leq .01$	Non-CUNY vs. CUNY, Never-in-school, Dropouts	grouped data
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Location Variables	Survey; raw data

TABLE 4

Demographic Characteristics: Mean Scores on Selected Demographic Variables for Each Analytic Group

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Age	N	1605	262	93	181	2141
	$\bar{X}$	21.1	19.0	23.0	20.6	20.9
	S.D.	± 6.28	± 3.39	± 7.45	± 5.44	± 6.04
Hours Worked Per Week	N	1612	263	94	182	2151
	$\bar{X}$	9.6	11.1	25.6	26.5	11.9
	S.D.	±13.89	±13.65	±18.16	±17.72	±15.43
Family College History	N	1289	218	76	142	1725
	$\bar{X}$	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.3
	S.D.	± 0.72	± 0.69	± 0.79	± 0.76	± 0.72
Number of Dependents	N	1311	242	88	182	1823
	$\bar{X}$	0.60	0.32	1.16	0.77	0.61
	S.D.	± 1.20	± 0.63	± 1.54	± 0.84	± 1.15
Mobility Index	N	1612	263	94	181	2150
	$\bar{X}$	3.0	3.7	2.5	2.9	3.0
	S.D.	± 2.10	± 2.03	± 1.79	± 1.86	± 2.08

Hours worked per week. The AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK is equivalent to several other variables (Working/Not Working, Working Part Time/Full Time), and distinguishes between the CUNY attender vs. the Dropout and Never-in-school groups, as well as between non-CUNY attenders and the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups. Table 4 shows that students enrolled in the CUNY community colleges work, on the average, 9.6 hours a week, the fewest hours of any group. It is also noteworthy that CUNY attenders are most likely to have work experience that is not related to their career goals (i.e., to the career of their first choice).

It is not surprising that students in the two groups not in school at the present time (i.e., when the Survey was administered) would work more hours per week than those in the in-school respondent groups. Nor is it surprising that significant differences were found in the numbers of students currently working and working full-time. We can presume that work situations would have been different for all groups had the Survey been administered at the time students were first applying to CUNY, or at the time of registration. Thus, while these data are useful in describing the groups after enrollment

decisions are made, we cannot be certain that these "work" variables would describe enrollment status if measured at the time of application.

History of family college attendance. Whether some CLOSE FAMILY MEMBER ATTENDED COLLEGE (scored as "1") AND GRADUATED (scored as "2") distinguishes among analytic groups. Significantly more non-CUNY attenders had at least one close relative who attended and graduated from college than any other group. The Never-in-school group contained the fewest respondents reporting family members who had had college experience. This variable discriminated between CUNY attenders vs. the Never-in-school group and between the latter group and non-CUNY attenders, and strongly suggests a relationship between family educational history and the decision to continue one's education. (See Table 4).

Number of dependents. The NUMBER OF FINANCIAL DEPENDENTS differentiates between the following groups: CUNY attenders vs. Non-CUNY attenders and Dropouts, and non-CUNY attenders vs. Dropouts and the Never-in-school respondent. As can be seen by examining the mean number of reported dependents (including self), the out-of-school groups report the most--especially Dropouts among whom married students are overrepresented. Non-CUNY attenders (among whom single people predominate) report the fewest number of financial dependents. Again, and not unanticipated, the decision to enroll and remain in college seems related to family financial responsibility.

Mobility index, and the individual location variables, are related to group membership to a low but significant degree: where their high school was located, where they lived during college, where the college of first choice is located, where their present school is located, where they live now, and where they currently work. Although the intercorrelations among these variables range from .08 to .58 (Cramer's V), the individual location variables seem of more limited usefulness in distinguishing members of each analytic group than is geographic pattern, or MOBILITY INDEX--the number of different locations as a percentage of all location variables and expressed, in Table 4, as an index. The higher the score, the more likely the group was to go to school, live, and work in more different locations: possible scores ranged from 1 (indicating all locations reported were the same) to 8 (denoting all locations were different). Non-CUNY attenders, as can be

seen, are the most mobile group, followed by CUNY attenders. The findings suggest that the decision to attend college is in some way related to a broader range of exposure to more varied geographical environments.

ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS

The set of variables relating to students' academic performance in high school and to CUNY's SKILLS ASSESSMENT Tests are presented in Table 5, below. As can be seen in Table 5 (and Table 6 which summarizes group means and standard deviations), high school achievement in academic subjects generally discriminates among the four analytic groups, while the three skills assessment tests do not. In examining these results, it is interesting to note that proportionately more CUNY attenders passed the reading test (29%) than the writing (25%) or the math tests (23%), with but only 7 percent of the group passing all three. Of the total, 22 percent failed one of the three, 32 percent failed two, (one of which was most likely math), and the remaining 39 percent failed all three tests.

TABLE 5

A Listing of Academic Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE
NS	Reading Skills Assessment	SHOW-REG
NS	Writing Skills Assessment	SHOW-REG
NS	Math Skills Assessment	SHOW-REG
NS	Skills Assessment Index	SHOW-REG; grouped data
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	High School Type	COLLAD
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	*GED/nonGED	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .01$	*College Admissions Average	COLLAD
$t \leq .05$	CUNY vs. Non-CUNY, Never-in-school;	
$t \leq .05$	Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	
ANOVA $\leq .0001$	*English High School Average	COLLAD; grouped data
$t \leq .01$	CUNY vs. Non-CUNY;	
$t \leq .01$	Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school, Dropouts	
ANOVA $\leq .0001$	*Math High School Average	COLLAD; grouped data
$t \leq .01$	Non-CUNY vs. CUNY, Never-in-school	
ANOVA $\leq .001$	*Science High School Average	COLLAD; grouped data
$t \leq .05$	Non-CUNY vs. CUNY, Never-in-school	

College admission average. This score, developed by OAS, is based on grades in selected high school subjects, and significantly distinguishes among the analytic groups: mean scores of CUNY attenders and non-CUNY school attenders differ ($p \leq .05$), as do the means between non-CUNY attenders vs. Dropouts and the Never-in-school group. Students allocated to but attending colleges other than the CUNY two-year schools have the highest average (see Table 6, below); those who never enrolled in postsecondary study

TABLE 6

Academic Characteristics: Mean Scores on Selected High School Academic Variables for Each Analytic Group

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
College Admissions Average	N	1479	253	81	169	1982
	$\bar{X}$	73.8	76.3	73.1	72.3	73.9
	S.D.	±6.43	±6.95	±4.50	±6.52	±6.51
English HS Average	N	1450	250	80	164	1944
	$\bar{X}$	4.7	5.1	4.6	4.3	4.7
	S.D.	±1.37	±1.47	±1.05	±1.44	±1.39
Math HS Average	N	1015	213	46	116	1390
	$\bar{X}$	3.9	4.5	3.7	3.5	3.9
	S.D.	±1.78	±1.93	±1.51	±1.75	±1.81
Science HS Average	N	1422	247	80	160	1909
	$\bar{X}$	4.4	4.7	4.2	4.3	4.4
	S.D.	±1.48	±1.61	±1.24	±1.53	±1.49
Type of HS/Diploma[a]	N	1335	219	75	151	1780
Academic HS diploma	%	60%	65%	51%	57%	60%
	S.D.	±0.49	±0.48	±0.50	±0.50	±0.49
Vocational HS diploma	%	15%	13%	15%	22%	16%
	S.D.	±0.36	±0.34	±0.36	±0.41	±0.36
GED	%	12%	3%	11%	10%	11%
	S.D.	±0.33	±0.18	±0.31	±0.29	±0.31

[a]Does not include "other" respondents who received secondary-level diplomas from non-public schools in New York City and from out-of-the City.

the lowest. Dropouts also have a low COLLEGE ADMISSION AVERAGE (not different from that of CUNY attenders).

English high school average. Like the COLLEGE ADMISSION AVERAGE score, the ENGLISH HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE score with which it is highly correlated, is a composite score based on grades in selected English courses. This score is highly significant statistically ($p \leq .0001$) in differentiating among the major study groups. Transformed, grouped scores (where 1=ENGLISH HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE of 59 and below, 2=60 to 64.9, 3=65 to 69.9, etc), which are summarized in Table 6, illustrate the critical differences between CUNY and non-CUNY attenders, and between non-CUNY attenders, Dropouts, and students in the Never-in-school group. Since this variable yields virtually identical results as that for the COLLEGE ADMISSION AVERAGE, it may not be necessary to use more than one of these scores to predict enrollment.

Math high school average is also an OAS-derived average score composed of grades in selected HIGH SCHOOL MATH COURSES. Similar to the English score, we grouped the math average score so that 1=math average of below 59, 2=60 to 64.9, and so on; these transformed scores and standard deviations for each analytic group are presented in Table 6. The overall ANOVA was highly significant ($p \leq .0001$), and the means for non-CUNY attenders vs. CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school group differ significantly ($p \leq .01$). Note that again, the non-CUNY school attender group exhibited by far the highest math score.

Science high school average is another derived score which we treated similarly to the Math and English high school averages with which it is also highly correlated. The SCIENCE HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE differentiates among the analytic groups overall (ANOVA, $p \leq .001$), with statistically significant means when the non-CUNY attender group is compared with CUNY attenders and with the Never-in-school group. (See Table 6, page 20.)

The COLLEGE ADMISSION AVERAGE and the three high school ACADEMIC AVERAGES (ENGLISH, MATH, AND SCIENCE) are highly intercorrelated, with $r = .72$ to .85. These averages are all correlated to a low-moderate level ($.17 \leq r \leq .25$) with

success on the Skills Assessment Test battery and with assignment (self-reported) to remedial courses ($-.15 \leq r \leq +.23$).

Other significant variables of potential interest for possible inclusion in the discriminant analyses relate to the type of high school the applicant attended and to the type of diploma awarded. High school (and diplomas) are categorized in several ways by OAS (e.g., public/nonpublic, academic/vocational), but the most useful classification is a combined high school and diploma type: ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL/VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL/GED, each scored YES-NO and treated statistically as dummy variables.

Type of high school/diploma. An examination of these three variables (which together with "other", the reference group consisting of the respondents who attended nonpublic secondary schools and ones out-of-the City, constitute the total sample) shows that, for example, 60 percent of the CUNY attenders were graduated from New York City academic high schools, 15 percent from vocational high schools, 13 percent from "other" high schools, and 12 percent obtained the GED. Although overall this variable is significant, it is only with respect to the GED that the analytic groups are differentiated--and then only between the CUNY and the non-CUNY college attenders.

As generalizations, based on the evidence accumulated thus far, those allocants most likely to enroll in CUNY community colleges--and persist into the second semester--may be characterized as older than the non-CUNY attender, as likely as other school attenders to come from families with a history of college attendance, fairly mobile, and with relatively few dependents. Although working, CUNY enrollees work few hours a week and generally do not have work experiences that relate to the career they list as a goal. Academically, the CUNY community college enrollee has a lower college admission average than do students choosing other schools, and this holds true for English, science, and mathematics scores. In addition, proportionately more CUNY attenders than non-CUNY attenders have earned GEDs.

NONACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Questionnaire Survey items about specific and general activities during the high school years supplemented our information about respondents' secondary educational experiences. Treated as discrete variables, those activities that do and do not distinguish the four analytic groups are presented in Table 7 on the next page, and those of potential

TABLE 7

A Listing of Nonacademic Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE
NS	Used High School Library	Survey
NS	Participated in HS Sports	Survey
NS	Used HS Guidance Services	Survey
NS	Worked on HS Newspaper	Survey
NS	Worked for HS Organization(s)	Survey
NS	Took courses at other school during HS	Survey
NS	Had Friends Who Attended "my" College	Survey
NS	Had Friends With "my" Career Interests	Survey
NS	Had Friends Who Dropped Out of School	Survey
NS	HS Satisfaction Index	{Survey; {grouped data
NS	Satisfied with HS's Vocational Emphasis	Survey
NS	Satisfied with How Hard "I" Studied	Survey
NS	Satisfied with "my" HS grades	Survey
NS	Satisfied with How HS Prepared "me" for College	Survey
NS	Satisfied with What "I" Learned in HS	Survey
NS	Satisfied with How Good a HS Student "I" was	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t_{\leq .05}$	*Satisfied with How the HS Prepared me for Work CUNY vs. Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t_{\leq .05}$	*Satisfied with the Counseling "I" Received in HS CUNY vs. Non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t_{\leq .05}$	*Membership in Social Clubs CUNY vs. Non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t_{\leq .05}$	*Used HS Job Placement Office CUNY vs. Non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t_{\leq .05}$	*Did Volunteer Work CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t_{\leq .05}$	*Worked Afterschool and/or Summers CUNY vs. Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t_{\leq .05}$	*Took PSAT/SAT tests Non-CUNY vs. CUNY, Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t_{\leq .5}$	*High School Activity Index CUNY vs. Non-CUNY, Never-in-school	Survey; grouped data

interest noted (*) and discussed. In addition to the activity variables and an overall ACTIVITY INDEX, there are three high school satisfaction variables--SATISFACTION WITH THE COUNSELING RECEIVED IN HIGH SCHOOL, SATISFACTION WITH THE SCHOOL'S ACADEMIC EMPHASIS, and SATISFACTION with how well the school PREPARED ONE FOR WORK--which significantly differentiated the analytic groups. These are not appreciably correlated with the activity variables.

Scores (means and standard deviations) of selected of these variables are summarized in Table 8, below, and briefly discussed in the following pages.

TABLE 8

Nonacademic Characteristics: Mean Scores on Selected High School Experience (Nonacademic) Variables for Each Analytic Group

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Satisfaction with Work Preparation	N	1482	246	84	169	1981
	$\bar{X}$	1.59	1.58	1.59	1.47	1.58
	S.D.	±0.49	±0.49	±0.49	±0.50	±0.49
Satisfaction with HS Counseling	N	1493	255	84	169	2001
	$\bar{X}$	1.43	1.53	1.51	1.42	1.45
	S.D.	±0.50	±0.50	±0.50	±0.50	±0.50
Social Club Membership	N	1534	256	85	169	2044
	$\bar{X}$	1.66	1.55	1.65	1.68	1.65
	S.D.	±0.47	±0.50	±0.48	±0.47	±0.48
Used Job Placement Office	N	1530	255	86	168	2039
	$\bar{X}$	1.73	1.70	1.76	1.60	1.72
	S.D.	±0.44	±0.46	±0.43	±0.49	±0.45
Volunteer Work	N	1527	253	85	161	2032
	$\bar{X}$	1.66	1.58	1.62	1.54	1.64
	S.D.	±0.47	±0.49	±0.49	±0.50	±0.48
Summer/ After school Paid Work	N	1530	257	84	165	2036
	$\bar{X}$	1.37	1.25	1.40	1.41	1.36
	S.D.	±0.48	±0.43	±0.49	±0.49	±0.48
PSAT/SAT Tests	N	1491	251	85	160	1987
	$\bar{X}$	1.46	1.20	1.42	1.44	1.42
	S.D.	±0.50	±0.40	±0.50	±0.50	±0.49
HS Activity Index	N	1546	258	86	171	2061
	$\bar{X}$	3.75	4.56	3.97	4.17	3.89
	S.D.	±2.03	±1.75	±2.00	±2.06	±2.02

Satisfaction with preparation for work. This variable, and the others relating to satisfaction, were scored as dummy variables: yes, SATISFIED (=1) and no, NOT SATISFIED (=2); thus, the lower means in Table 8 indicate that proportionately more of the respondents were satisfied. Satisfaction with how well HIGH SCHOOL PREPARED ONE FOR WORK significantly discriminates the Never-in-school group from the CUNY and non-CUNY college attender. As can be seen in Table 8, those who did not enroll in college after completion of their high school education were more satisfied than those who did--a heartening finding in light of the fact that more of them tended to enter the job market after high school graduation. It should be noted that students' satisfaction may have been affected by their experiences between the time they applied to CUNY and the time of the Survey.

Satisfaction with high school counseling differentiates CUNY and non-CUNY attenders. CUNY attenders (and the Never-in-school group) were the most satisfied groups with respect to the HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELING they received (the lowest means --see Table 8), while students enrolled in non-CUNY schools were least satisfied with the advice they got.

Other than satisfaction, the questionnaire included a list of activities students might engage in during their high school years. For each, respondents indicated whether yes, they participated (=1) or no, they did not participate (=2). Five of these activities--MEMBERSHIP IN A SOCIAL CLUB, use of school's JOB PLACEMENT OFFICE, VOLUNTEER WORK, SUMMER AND/OR AFTERSCHOOL JOBS, and whether the student took the PSAT/SAT TESTS--as well as an overall ACTIVITY INDEX (the number of activities engaged in as a percentage of all activities)--significantly differentiated among the analytic groups. The mean scores and standard deviations of these activities are summarized in Table 8; the lower the mean, the greater the proportion of students who engaged in an activity.

Social club membership. MEMBERSHIP IN SOCIAL CLUBS during high school distinguishes between CUNY and non-CUNY attender groups and between non-CUNY attenders and students who reported they were Never-in-school. Proportionately most non-CUNY school attenders were members of social clubs, while the Never-in-school

group was least likely to participate in this kind of activity.

Job placement office. Whether or not students used the high schools' JOB PLACEMENT OFFICE significantly discriminates CUNY attenders and Dropouts from non-CUNY attenders. Students in the Never-in-school group made the most use of the placement office, while Dropouts were least likely to.

Volunteer work during high school is another variable that distinguishes the CUNY attender from the student in the Never-in-school group: Table 8 shows that CUNY attenders did the least VOLUNTEER WORK of any of the analytic groups, while students who did not attend college (Never-in-school) were most involved in volunteer activities.

Afterschool and/or summer jobs. As can be seen from an examination of the mean scores, WORKING AFTERSCHOOL AND/OR SUMMERS during high school differentiates between non-CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school group. The non-CUNY attender is more likely than the other groups to have worked, while the respondent who was in the Never-in-school group was least likely to have had a paid afterschool or summer job.

PSAT/SAT tests. Whether or not one takes the PSAT/SAT TESTS can be considered indicative of contemplating a college that requires these tests for admission. The non-CUNY school attender group was most likely to have taken these tests, while CUNY attenders were least likely. Significant differences in means were obtained for non-CUNY attenders vs. CUNY attenders, Dropouts, and the Never-in-school group. The pattern accords with a realistic assessment of external requirements.

The high school activity index scores support the general picture that emerged from the individual items comprising this composite variable: CUNY attenders have the lowest overall mean ACTIVITY INDEX and non-CUNY attenders have the highest score. This variable is significantly different for these two groups as it is between CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school group. To predict enrollment in CUNY, knowledge of selected activities and an ACTIVITY INDEX score may prove to be useful.

COLLEGE INFORMATION

The questionnaire contained several questions relating to differences between CUNY, SUNY, and private schools; to program differences; and to the relationship between performance on the CUNY Skills Assessment Test battery and remedial courses. Each of these questions, in the form of separate variables, and their ability to differentiate among the analytic groups, is listed in Table 9 below. Table 10, page 29, addresses selected significant variables in this set.

TABLE 9

A Listing of College Information Variables: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLE	DATA SOURCE
NS	Effectiveness of Remedial Courses	Survey
NS	Remedial Courses are Embarrassing	Survey
NS	Remedial Courses are Annoying	Survey
NS	Knew Public/Private School Tuition Differences	Survey
NS	Knew Career Program/Trade School Differences	Survey
NS	Knew Full Time/Part Time Status Differences	Survey
NS	Knew Day/Evening Session Differences	Survey
NS	Knew Difference between Public/Private School	Survey
NS	Knew about Financial Aid Alternatives	Survey
NS	Knew about Remedial Courses	Survey
NS	Knowledge Index	Survey
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	*Needed Remedial Courses Non-CUNY vs. CUNY, Never-in-school; Dropouts vs. Never-in-school	Survey; grouped data
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	*Expectations about Remedial Assignments CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Knew Difference between Liberal Arts/ Career Programs CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Knew SUNY/CUNY Differences CUNY vs. Non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Knew Differences between Associate/ Bachelor's Degree Never-in-school vs. CUNY, Non-CUNY	Survey

Before proceeding with a discussion of those variables on which the groups differed, it should be noted that there were no differences on certain variables because proportionately similar numbers of respondents in each group reported they knew "something" ("2", the mid-point on a 3-point scale where "3" = a lot) about the differences between: COLLEGE CAREER PROGRAMS AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS OFFERED BY TRADE/TECHNICAL SCHOOLS, TUITION AT TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES, FULL- AND PART-TIME STUDENT STATUS, ATTENDING DAY OR EVENING CLASSES, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS, AND FINANCIAL AID ALTERNATIVES.

Knowledge of liberal arts vs. career programs. KNOWLEDGE ABOUT LIBERAL ARTS AND CAREER PROGRAMS was measured on a 3-point scale (1=almost nothing, 3=a lot), as were the next two variables discussed. This item differentiates the analytic groups. The difference in means between CUNY attenders and those in the Never-in-school group was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Group means, presented in Table 10, page 29, indicate that CUNY attenders feel they knew more about this aspect of college at the time they were applying than did the other groups, although some of the inter-group differences were small.

Knowledge of SUNY/CUNY differences at the time of application also significantly distinguishes the analytic groups: CUNY attenders from non-CUNY attenders and non-CUNY attenders from Dropouts and the Never-in-school group. Average scores show that non-CUNY attenders claimed to be the most knowledgeable (possibly due to the fact that some students in this group attend SUNY), while Dropouts knew the least about the differences between colleges in the SUNY and in the CUNY systems.

Knowledge of associate/bachelor's degree. Self-reported knowledge about the DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ASSOCIATE AND THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE when applying to college distinguishes between CUNY attenders and those Never-in-school, as well as between the latter group and non-CUNY college attenders. Those attending colleges other than CUNY community colleges felt they were most knowledgeable, as can be seen in the mean scores in Table 10, although all groups indicated that they knew more than "something".

TABLE 10

College Information: Mean Scores on Selected College Information Variables for Each Analytic Group

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Liberal Arts vs. Career Programs	N	1557	256	86	169	2068
	$\bar{X}$	2.12	2.01	1.93	1.91	2.08
	S.D.	±0.78	±0.77	±0.79	±0.81	±0.78
SUNY vs. CUNY Differences	N	1563	256	88	171	2078
	$\bar{X}$	1.85	2.08	1.67	1.85	1.86
	S.D.	±0.75	±0.76	±0.67	±0.69	±0.75
Associate vs. Bachelor Degree	N	1561	256	87	169	2073
	$\bar{X}$	2.25	2.29	2.11	2.02	2.23
	S.D.	±0.76	±0.78	±0.74	±0.79	±0.76
Reported Needing Remediation	N	1124	133	57	64	1388
	$\bar{X}$	0.75	0.64	0.63	0.84	0.73
	S.D.	±0.44	±0.48	±0.49	±0.37	±0.44
Expected Remedial Assignment(s)	N	987	125	61	53	1226
	$\bar{X}$	0.59	0.51	0.48	0.38	0.57
	S.D.	±0.49	±0.50	±0.50	±0.49	±0.50

Needed remedial help. Respondents who reported that "yes" they felt they NEEDED REMEDIAL HELP (scored as 1=yes and 0=no in Table 10) were distributed differentially among the four groups: Non-CUNY attenders were significantly different from CUNY attenders and from the Never-in-school group, and Dropouts differed significantly from those who were Never-in-school. Dropouts and non-CUNY attenders were most likely to feel they did not need remediation (the lower means in the table), while those in the Never-in-school group were most likely to feel they did. These findings suggest a reason for the actions both of students who drop out of college and those who decide not to enroll.

Expected remedial assignment(s). Expectations about TAKING REMEDIAL COURSES distinguish significantly only between the CUNY attender and the Never-in-school group; CUNY community college students were most likely to report that they expected to be assigned to remedial work. The mean scores (1=yes, 0=no) for the four analytic groups are summarized in Table 10.

REASONS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE

To better understand applicants' decisions to enroll in a CUNY community college, we included three questions on the Survey: one concerning the input of so-called influential others; the second with other alternatives the respondent may have considered. The third question dealt directly with college characteristics that might relate to choice of a college. These are listed in Table 11, below and continued on page 31; as indicated, almost all variables were statistically significant.

TABLE 11

Influences on Current & Future activities: A Listing of Variables, Data Sources, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLE	DATA SOURCE
NS	Influence of a College Representative	Survey
NS	Influence of College Personnel	Survey
NS	Influence of a High School Counselor	Survey
NS	Influence of a Family Member	Survey
NS	College Offered a Specific Career Program	Survey
NS	Relative Attended the College	Survey
NS	College had a Good Counseling Office	Survey
NS	Considered Part-time Work Alternative	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$; variance $\bar{X}$'s NS	Considered Armed Services No Differences	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Influence of a High School Teacher CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*School Reputation Non-CUNY vs. CUNY, Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$	*Own Interests Never-in-school vs. CUNY, Non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Considered Marriage Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey

TABLE 11 (continued)

ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Considered Taking Time Off Never-in-school vs. Non-CUNY; Never-on-school vs. CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Considered a CUNY 4-year College CUNY vs. Non-CUNY, Never-in-school	Survey
	*Considered Non-CUNY 4-year College	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Considered CUNY 2-year College Never-in-school vs. CUNY, Non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Considered a Trade or Technical School CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Good Job Placement Office Non-CUNY vs. CUNY, Dropouts; Non-CUNY vs. Never-on-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Caring People CUNY vs. Non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
	*Uncertain About Formal Degree Program	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Other Schools Required More Work Dropouts vs. CUNY, Non-CUNY; Dropouts vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Not Good Enough Grades Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Easier Courses Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .05$	*Tuition too Expensive Dropouts vs. Non-CUNY; Dropouts vs. CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Enough Work to Support Self Dropouts vs. CUNY, Non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Convenient Location CUNY vs. Non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Friends Went There CUNY vs. Non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	Radio Advertisements CUNY vs. Non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	Considered Full-Time Work CUNY vs. Non-CUNY, Dropouts, Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey

Four of the "influence" variables (that of a HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER, the COLLEGE'S REPUTATION, the respondents' OWN INTERESTS, and RADIO ADVERTISEMENTS) significantly differentiate among the analytic groups. These variables are intercorrelated to a low degree, and no one of them stands out as representative. We will discuss each together with other significant variables listed in Table 12 (see below and page 33) in the section that follows.

Influence of high school teacher. This, as with all the influence variables, was scored on a 3-point scale where the higher the score, the more influential the respondent rated the factor in his/her decision: 3=very much, 2=some, 1=not at all. TEACHER

TABLE 12

Reasons for Attending College: Mean Scores on Selected Variables Relating to Choice of Schooling for Each Analytic Group

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
HS Teachers Were Influential	N	1538	254	77	77	1946
	$\bar{X}$	1.55	1.60	1.60	1.81	1.57
	S.D.	±0.74	±0.75	±0.75	±0.84	±0.74
College's Reputation Was Influential	N	1544	256	76	77	1953
	$\bar{X}$	1.71	2.15	1.72	1.82	1.78
	S.D.	±0.75	±0.78	±0.78	±0.81	±0.77
Own Interests Influenced Choice	N	1561	256	77	78	1972
	$\bar{X}$	2.71	2.73	2.56	2.45	2.69
	S.D.	±0.55	±0.53	±0.68	±0.75	±0.56
Considered Marriage	N	1516	255	81	153	2005
	$\bar{X}$	1.19	1.10	1.28	1.24	1.19
	S.D.	±0.50	±0.37	±0.64	±0.54	±0.50
Considered Taking Time-Off	N	1499	253	81	157	1980
	$\bar{X}$	1.26	1.20	1.31	1.38	1.26
	S.D.	±0.55	±0.47	±0.63	±0.62	±0.55
Considered a CUNY 4-yr. College	N	1547	257	85	158	2047
	$\bar{X}$	2.18	1.90	2.01	2.01	2.13
	S.D.	±0.77	±0.76	±0.85	±0.83	±0.78
Considered Full-Time Work	N	1519	256	81	157	2013
	$\bar{X}$	1.98	1.77	2.31	2.52	2.01
	S.D.	±0.83	±0.79	±0.75	±0.69	±0.83

TABLE 12 (continued)

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Considered a Non-CUNY 4-yr. College	N	1522	255	80	153	2010
	$\bar{X}$	1.81	1.93	1.62	1.66	1.81
	S.D.	±0.77	±0.82	±0.77	±0.76	±0.78
Considered a CUNY 2-yr. College	N	1515	259	83	158	2011
	$\bar{X}$	1.80	1.72	1.86	2.12	1.82
	S.D.	±0.75	±0.77	±0.83	±0.79	±0.76
Considered a Trade, Technical School	N	1518	254	80	153	2005
	$\bar{X}$	1.60	1.67	1.84	1.84	1.64
	S.D.	±0.74	±0.81	±0.83	±0.83	±0.76
Good Job Placement Office Important	N	1450	238	48	22	1758
	$\bar{X}$	1.89	2.13	1.71	1.68	1.91
	S.D.	±0.73	±0.74	±0.74	±0.72	±0.74
Caring College Personnel Important	N	1489	243	51	21	1801
	$\bar{X}$	1.86	2.05	1.73	1.57	1.88
	S.D.	±0.71	±0.72	±0.80	±0.75	±0.71
Wanted a Formal Degree Program	N	103	229	28	23	383
	$\bar{X}$	1.39	1.34	1.86	1.48	1.40
	S.D.	±0.61	±0.63	±0.85	±0.73	±0.66
Other Schools Require More Work	N	1504	246	51	27	1828
	$\bar{X}$	1.24	1.26	1.55	1.19	1.25
	S.D.	±0.54	±0.57	±0.78	±0.48	±0.55
Not Good Enough Grades For Other Schools	N	1510	246	52	27	1835
	$\bar{X}$	1.54	1.44	1.73	1.74	1.59
	S.D.	±0.71	±0.65	±0.80	±0.76	±0.68
Easier Courses At This School	N	1491	243	51	26	1811
	$\bar{X}$	1.23	1.19	1.39	1.35	1.23
	S.D.	±0.48	±0.48	±0.63	±0.69	±0.49
Tuition Too High At Other Schools	N	1495	246	51	24	1816
	$\bar{X}$	1.65	1.54	1.96	1.62	1.64
	S.D.	±0.75	±0.72	±0.87	±0.88	±0.76
Can Work And Go To School	N	1469	238	50	24	1781
	$\bar{X}$	1.43	1.44	1.80	1.38	1.44
	S.D.	±0.67	±0.66	±0.81	±0.67	±0.67
School is Conveniently Located	N	1515	244	53	25	1837
	$\bar{X}$	2.00	1.78	2.02	1.68	1.96
	S.D.	±0.83	±0.79	±0.89	±0.80	±0.83
Friends Attend This School	N	1513	248	53	26	1840
	$\bar{X}$	1.34	1.22	1.47	1.12	1.32
	S.D.	±0.61	±0.50	±0.70	±0.33	±0.60

RECOMMENDATIONS about attending college, and about attending a particular college, had the least influence on the CUNY attender group and the greatest reported influence on the Never-in-school group; significant differences obtained only between these means.

College's reputation. THE REPUTATION OF A COLLEGE distinguishes CUNY from non-CUNY attenders and non-CUNY attenders from both the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups. As the mean scores illustrate, non-CUNY attenders were most influenced by the college's reputation, while fewer CUNY attenders and Dropouts reported that this factor was of importance in their decision to attend college.

"Own interests." One's OWN INTERESTS is a very important factor in the decision to continue schooling as can be seen in the high mean scores of the four analytic groups summarized in Table 12, and the degree of import differentiates the CUNY and non-CUNY attender from the Never-in-school group.

When it came to what alternatives were considered--other than going to the specific college respondents were attending (had attended)--all options listed on the questionnaire differentiated among the analytic groups. Eight of these variables were significant overall (ANOVA), but in only seven of them were group means different (t-tests): there were no differences among respondent groups considering JOINING THE ARMED SERVICES. There were differences in the seriousness with which groups considered the following: GETTING MARRIED (and not going to school), taking TIME-OFF, a CUNY FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE, a NON-CUNY FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE, (another) CUNY COMMUNITY COLLEGE (other than the one attended), TRADE OR TECHNICAL school, and WORKING FULL TIME. In Table 12 which summarizes the group means and standard deviations for these variables, the higher the score, the more strongly was the alternative considered by the respondent: 3=considered the alternative "very seriously", 2="somewhat", and 1="not at all". Although these variables are intercorrelated to a low-moderate degree ($.11 \leq r \leq .24$), none is strong enough to substitute for the others as a sole predictor.

Marriage. Both Dropouts and respondents who were Never-in-school are significantly different from non-CUNY attenders in how strongly they considered

MARRIAGE (as an alternative to further schooling and/or work) after completion of their high school education. This was a more serious alternative for the groups not in school than for those attending college.

Time-off. Take TIME-OFF (no school, no work) was also more attractive an option for the groups not currently in school, as can be seen by examination of the mean scores for the four analytic groups. The difference was significant between the Never-in-school group and both the CUNY and the non-CUNY attender groups.

Working full time as an alternative to college was most strongly considered by those who decided not to enroll and by those who dropped out. Significant differences were obtained between CUNY attenders and non-CUNY attenders and between both these groups and the groups not currently in school.

CUNY four-year college. Going to a CUNY FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE was a strong option for CUNY college attenders--more so than any other group; it was least attractive to the non-CUNY attender. This variable significantly distinguishes the CUNY from the non-CUNY attender and from the Never-in-school group; the mean scores for these groups are significantly different.

Non-CUNY four-year college. As expected, non-CUNY attenders (most of whom are enrolled in four-year colleges and universities) most strongly considered going to a FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE in contrast to those in the Never-in-school group; the mean scores for these groups are significantly different.

CUNY two-year college. How strongly a CUNY COMMUNITY COLLEGE was considered distinguishes the CUNY (community college) attender and non-CUNY school attender from the Never-in-school group. Interestingly, of all analytic groups, those respondents who were Never-in-school considered this option most strongly.

Trade or technical school was a much more important option for both of the groups not currently in school that it was for the CUNY attenders. The differences in means were statistically significant for CUNY attenders and non-CUNY attenders in comparison

to both Dropouts and the Never-in-school group.

Table 12 also lists 11 significant variables that dealt directly with beliefs about college characteristics and that may relate to the decision to continue schooling. These variables, scored 1 to 3 (where 1=not important at all, 2=somewhat important, and 3=very important) are discussed below.

Good job placement office. The relative importance of a GOOD COLLEGE JOB PLACEMENT OFFICE differentiates between CUNY and non-CUNY attenders and between non-CUNY attenders vs. Dropouts and the group Never-in-school. The mean scores suggest that non-CUNY attenders felt most strongly that this was an important college characteristic. (See Table 12, pages 32-33.)

Caring college personnel. Non-CUNY attenders believed more strongly than any other group that it is important for college personnel to care about what happens to students; respondents who were Never-in-school thought this characteristic was relatively unimportant. Differences were significant between CUNY and non-CUNY attenders and between non-CUNY attenders and both the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups.

Formal degree program. Dropouts, more so than the other groups, were most uncertain about wanting to be in a DEGREE PROGRAM, while both of the groups currently in school were least uncertain--i.e., most sure. Although it discriminated between CUNY attenders vs. Dropouts and between non-CUNY attenders vs. Dropouts, the small Ns make this variable useless as a predictor.

Other schools require more work. On this variable, CUNY and non-CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school group were all significantly different from Dropouts: Dropouts were most likely to report that the school they chose to attend required less work of them than they thought other schools would.

Not having good enough grades for acceptance by (other) schools was a strongly expressed belief of the group who had dropped out of school and by the Never-in-school group. In contrast, non-CUNY attenders were least likely to feel this way, while the beliefs of CUNY attenders were intermediate in this regard. Mean differences were

significant only between the non-CUNY attender and Dropout groups.

Easier courses characterize the schools the Dropout group described than those of the other groups. Non-CUNY attenders were least likely to feel that their COLLEGE COURSES WERE EASIER. The higher mean scores in Table 12 indicate that the respondents agreed that courses were easier at their chosen school than elsewhere. Significant differences obtained only for non-CUNY attenders vs. Dropouts. One interpretation is that experienced or presumed difficulty with coursework is not a factor in the decision to drop out or not enroll in college.

Tuition at other schools. The Dropout group most strongly believed that they could not AFFORD THE TUITION at a school other than the one in which they had been enrolled; non-CUNY attenders were least likely to believe this. The differences in means between Dropouts and both in-school groups were significant.

Work. Beliefs about whether or not the college would permit students to Work enough to support themselves differentiates among analytic groups, with significant differences between the means of Dropouts vs. CUNY and non-CUNY attenders. Dropouts indicated that they would be able to WORK ENOUGH TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES while attending college. Although not clear, this finding suggests that one reason for dropping out may be the inability to manage schooling and the desired amount of work at the same time.

Convenient location of the institution was an important school characteristic for CUNY attenders and Dropouts but was not an important factor for the Never-in-school group; non-CUNY attenders gave some importance to this variable which significantly distinguished both this group and the Never-in-school group from both the CUNY attender and the Dropout.

Friends went there. Whether one had FRIENDS AT THE COLLEGE was an important factor in the Dropouts' choice of school but was of much less importance in the decision of respondents in the Never-in-school group. There were significant differences in means between CUNY and non-CUNY attenders and between Dropouts and non-CUNY

attenders. Mean scores are summarized in Table 12.

In examining this set of variables, it would seem that the Dropout group can best be characterized as ambivalent about enrolling in college and may have done so for reasons that were not directly educational in focus, and/or for reasons that reflect incomplete and/or erroneous information about postsecondary educational institutions. Those students attending schools other than the CUNY community colleges seem to have more accurate information about education and a more realistic assessment of their own expectations and aptitudes, as well as a grasp of the characteristics of the schools they attend. CUNY attenders appear to fall between these two extremes.

RELATION BETWEEN EDUCATION AND JOBS AND SALARIES

Another set of questions concerned respondents' beliefs about the value of education--particularly how education relates to getting a good job and commanding a high salary. Each Survey item, treated as a separate variable in the data analysis, is listed in Table 13, page 39.

Three of the items related to obtaining a GOOD JOB were significant in distinguishing among the analytic groups; these items are intercorrelated to a moderate degree ($.24 \leq r \leq .56$). Similar correlations are found among the significant items relating to obtaining HIGH SALARIES, and there is high correlation between getting good jobs and commanding high salaries for each level of education ($.54 \leq r \leq .65$) about which respondents were queried. It is likely that beliefs about good jobs and beliefs about high salaries are well-enough related that, for a given level of education, one or the other will predict analytic group membership.

Five of the items shown in detail in Table 14 (page 40) will be described in the following pages. Means are based on a 3-point scale where 1="few" good jobs/high salaries are possible, 2="some", and 3="many". Thus, the higher the mean, the more likely the respondent group felt that good jobs/high salaries were probable given a particular level of education.

Good jobs with a four-year degree. Significant differences obtained for CUNY attenders vs. the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups. As can be seen from the means in Table 14 on page 40, CUNY attenders were strongest in their belief that a four-year

TABLE 13

A Listing of Variables Relating Education to Jobs and Salaries:
Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC	VARIABLE	SOURCE
NS	Good Jobs/GED	Survey
NS	Good Jobs/Trade Technical training	Survey
NS	Good Jobs/High School Diploma	Survey
NS	Good Jobs/2-yr. Liberal Arts Degree	Survey
NS	Good Jobs/Armed Services training	Survey
NS	High Salary/2-yr. Liberal Arts Degree	Survey
NS	High Salary/Trade Technical training	Survey
NS	High Salary/Armed Services training	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Good Jobs/Professional Degree Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ (variance)	High Salary/4-yr. Degree	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	High Salary/Advanced Degree CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ (variance) $t \leq .01$	High Salary/2-yr. Career Program Degree CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*High Salary/GED CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$	Good Jobs/2-yr. Career Program Degree	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Good Jobs/4-yr. Degree CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Good Jobs/Advanced Degree CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*High Salary/H.S. Diploma CUNY vs. Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ (variance)	High Salary/Professional Degree	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*High Salary/Advanced Degree CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey

college degree is related to obtaining a good job; Dropouts, in contrast, saw this relationship as weakest. In general, in terms of good jobs, the groups currently enrolled in school value the four-year degree more highly than those not in school.

TABLE 14

Relation between Education and Jobs and Salary: Mean Scores on Variables Relating Educational Attainment to Jobs and Salary for Each Analytic Group

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Good Jobs With a Four-Year Degree	N	1495	252	86	160	1987
	$\bar{X}$	2.71	2.69	2.52	2.57	2.69
	S.D.	±0.49	±0.47	±0.59	±0.60	±0.50
Good Jobs With an Advanced Degree	N	1493	252	83	161	1989
	$\bar{X}$	2.83	2.86	2.66	2.65	2.81
	S.D.	±0.44	±0.39	±0.63	±0.63	±0.47
Good Jobs With a Professional Degree	N	1501	253	83	163	2000
	$\bar{X}$	2.86	2.90	2.78	2.77	2.86
	S.D.	±0.43	±0.34	±0.56	±0.54	±0.43
High Salary With a GED	N	1487	250	82	161	1980
	$\bar{X}$	1.37	1.39	1.43	1.50	1.39
	S.D.	±0.53	±0.52	±0.54	±0.57	±0.53
High Salary With a High School Diploma	N	1496	250	86	163	1995
	$\bar{X}$	1.66	1.65	1.73	1.86	1.68
	S.D.	±0.60	±0.60	±0.60	±0.65	±0.61
High Salary With an Advanced Degree	N	1492	250	84	162	1988
	$\bar{X}$	2.86	2.86	2.81	2.79	2.86
	S.D.	±0.37	±0.39	±0.42	±0.51	±0.38

Good jobs with an advanced degree. A similar pattern is evident with respect to the relationship between advanced degrees and good jobs: the groups attending school thought this relationship was stronger (i.e., more likely) than the two groups not (currently) in school. Significant differences exist for both CUNY and non-CUNY attenders vs. both the Dropout and Never-in-school groups. Mean scores and standard deviations for the analytic groups are summarized in Table 14.

Good jobs with a professional degree. Beliefs about this relationship discriminate significantly only between non-CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school group. As can be seen from an examination of the groups' scores, more of the former group expressed the feeling that good jobs are more likely with a professional degree.

High salary with a GED. This item significantly differentiated CUNY attenders from respondents who were Never-in-school. People who never enrolled in college felt that a GED could command a high salary, while fewer CUNY attenders felt this was likely. (See Table 14.)

High salary with a high school diploma. Again, the two groups not (currently) continuing their education beyond the high school level felt that a high salary was possible with only a high school diploma. The means for both CUNY and non-CUNY attenders differ significantly from those of the Never-in-school group.

High salary with an advanced degree. CUNY and non-CUNY attenders were most likely to believe that high salaries can be obtained with a graduate degree. A difference in mean scores was significant for CUNY attenders vs. the Never-in-school group.

In summary, respondents who enrolled in college and persisted at least into the second semester of the first year are more likely to place value on higher education as it relates to the likelihood of obtaining a good job and commanding a high salary. Dropouts and respondents who never enrolled in a postsecondary educational institution see a weaker relationship and are somewhat more likely to believe that good jobs and salaries are obtainable with lesser amounts of education. All groups, however, feel good jobs and high salaries are more likely with higher educational levels.

CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

The Survey included several questions pertaining to academic and vocational expectations, certainty of achieving these goals, and satisfaction with one's progress towards accomplishing them. Most of the items summarized in Table 15 on the following page discriminated among the groups. In addition to the individual items, we developed a summary DISSATISFACTION INDEX to describe the groups on these variables.

Expected level of education. Respondents were asked how much EDUCATION THEY EXPECTED TO COMPLETE; their responses (coded 1 = H.S. diploma, 2.5 = Some College/Trade or Technical School, 4 = Community College Degree, 5 = 4-Year College Degree, 6 = Professional Degree, 7 = Master's Degree, 8 = Doctorate) discriminate significantly between both CUNY and non-CUNY college attenders vs. both the Dropout and Never-in-school groups. The scores, as can be expected, show that college attenders have higher educational aspirations than those not (currently) in school. The group means and standard deviations are presented in Table 16, page 44. Note that the CUNY community college attenders aspire, overall, to a four-year college degree, while Dropouts and those Never-in-school generally expect to complete at least a two-year college education.

Family expectations: education. Respondents were asked about their FAMILIES' EXPECTATIONS with regard to EDUCATION. The responses were coded 1 = No College Expected and 2 = At Least Some College Expected of them. This variable distinguished the CUNY and non-CUNY attenders from the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups. The mean scores in Table 16 show that family-expectation patterns resemble the self-expectation patterns, although these two variables are not highly correlated.

Likelihood of completing desired level of schooling differentiates significantly among all analytic groups except CUNY attenders from the Never-in-school group. Coded so that the higher scores (in Table 16) represent a greater likelihood, it can be seen that CUNY and non-CUNY attenders are most confident about COMPLETING THEIR DESIRED EDUCATIONAL GOALS while Dropouts are least confident. All groups, however, feel "somewhat" or "very" likely able to meet their educational goals.

TABLE 15

A Listing of Variables Relating to Current Attitudes Toward Schooling: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE
NS	Certainty about Career Choice	Survey
NS	Likelihood of Returning if Schooling Interrupted	Survey
NS	Satisfaction w/Present Job	Survey
NS	Satisfaction w/Present Educational Progress	Survey
NS	Family Expectations: Lifestyle	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ (NS t-tests)	Satisfaction w/Progress Toward Graduation	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ ANOVA $\leq .01$ ANOVA $\leq .01$	*Expected Level of Education CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Family Expectations: Education Never-in-school vs. CUNY; non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Probability of Completing Desired Education CUNY vs. Dropouts; non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts; Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Probability of Interrupted Education Dropouts vs. CUNY; non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Probability of Job in Chosen Career Field Never-in-school vs. CUNY, non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Dissatisfaction Index Never-in-school vs. CUNY, non-CUNY; Dropouts vs. CUNY, non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Satisfaction w/Present School Dropouts vs. CUNY, non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Satisfaction w/Education Dropouts vs. CUNY, non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Satisfaction w/Major Dropouts vs. CUNY, non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Satisfaction w/Career Goals Dropouts vs. CUNY, non-CUNY; Never-in-school vs. CUNY, non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Satisfaction w/Decision to Contunue Schooling Dropouts vs. CUNY, non-CUNY; Never-in-school vs. CUNY, non-CUNY	Survey

TABLE 16

Current Attitudes Toward Schooling: Mean Scores on Expectations About and Satisfaction with Schooling

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Expected Level of Education	N	1568	255	87	170	2080
	$\bar{X}$	5.07	5.12	4.47	4.26	4.99
	S.D.	±1.30	±1.50	±1.72	±1.65	±1.40
Family Expectations: Education	N	1472	245	78	161	1956
	$\bar{X}$	1.88	1.90	1.79	1.78	1.87
	S.D.	±0.32	±0.30	±0.41	±0.42	±0.33
Likelihood of Completing Education	N	1515	261	88	174	2098
	$\bar{X}$	3.54	3.64	3.19	3.29	3.52
	S.D.	±0.60	±0.55	±0.86	±0.80	±0.63
Likelihood of Interrupted Education	N	1560	230	48	——	1848
	$\bar{X}$	2.12	1.99	2.69	——	2.12
	S.D.	±1.03	± .98	±1.19	——	±1.03
Likelihood of Working in Chosen Field	N	1584	260	85	152	2081
	$\bar{X}$	3.46	3.50	3.27	3.28	3.44
	S.D.	±0.66	±0.62	±0.93	±0.86	±0.69
Dissatisfaction Index	N	1530	249	62	85	1926
	$\bar{X}$	0.68	0.76	2.39	2.31	0.82
		±1.40	±1.46	±2.63	±3.12	±1.63
Satisfaction With Present School	N	1523	248	42	12	1825
	$\bar{X}$	2.30	2.36	1.83	1.92	2.30
	S.D.	±0.70	±0.70	±0.82	±0.79	±0.71
Satisfaction With Education	N	1520	248	44	13	1825
	$\bar{X}$	2.45	2.54	2.00	2.31	2.45
	S.D.	±0.61	±0.58	±0.78	±0.75	±0.62
Satisfaction With Major	N	1520	241	48	16	1825
	$\bar{X}$	2.58	2.59	2.04	2.38	2.57
	S.D.	±0.62	±0.63	±0.87	±0.89	±0.67
Satisfaction With Career Goals	N	1498	243	56	72	1869
	$\bar{X}$	2.56	2.58	2.29	2.06	2.53
	S.D.	±0.63	±0.63	±0.82	±0.80	±0.66
Satifaction With Decision to Continue	N	1513	248	58	66	1885
	$\bar{X}$	2.70	2.77	2.41	2.35	2.68
	S.D.	±0.54	±0.48	±0.75	±0.83	±0.56

Probability of interrupted education. This item, the probability that family financial obligations might INTERRUPT SCHOOLING, significantly distinguishes both CUNY and non-CUNY attenders from Dropouts. As is expected, Dropouts indicated that it likelier that their schooling could be interrupted, a response probably influenced by their experiences over the past few months. The groups in school indicate an interruption is only "somewhat" likely. A related item, the likelihood of returning to school to complete one's education after an interruption, did not distinguish among any groups.

Likelihood of a job in chosen career field. Dropouts and Never-in-school respondents are less certain than the college attender groups of obtaining a JOB IN THEIR CHOSEN CAREER FIELD. The following mean differences were statistically significant: CUNY attenders vs. Never-in-school; non-CUNY attenders vs. both the Dropout and Never-in-school groups.

Dissatisfaction index. A summary DISSATISFACTION INDEX based on nine items was developed and coded so that the higher the score, the greater was the dissatisfaction with self, expectations, and present accomplishments. It should also be noted that two of the nine variables--satisfaction with school and satisfaction with major--were not applicable to the Never-in-school group. Individual dissatisfaction scores were computed as proportions of questions answered, so that the groups' scores are comparable.

Scores could range from 1 (which means that 90% or more of the individual items responded to indicated satisfaction) to 9 (60% or fewer responses were "satisfied"). As can be seen from the Index scores for the four analytic groups summarized in Table 16, each of the two groups of college attenders was significantly more satisfied than was either of the groups not (currently) in school.

Since the items included in the calculation of the summary Index reflect students' perceptions at the time they completed the questionnaire, it is not useful as a predictor; it was intended primarily to describe students shortly after they exercise their decision about college enrollment. However, a similar Index could be developed around pre-college registration variables, and it seems probable that such a score would predict enrollment status or group membership.

Five of the eight individual items comprising the Index also differentiated among the groups, and will be discussed in the following pages. Each item was scored on a

3-point scale, where 1 = not very satisfied, 2 = somewhat satisfied, and 3 = very satisfied.

Satisfaction with school. As would be anticipated, those presently in school (i.e., enrolled at the time the Survey was administered) were more SATISFIED WITH THEIR SCHOOL than were Dropouts. These differences were statistically significant.

Satisfaction with education. Again, as expected, CUNY and non-CUNY attenders were the most satisfied with the EDUCATION THEY ARE RECEIVING, while Dropouts were the least satisfied. Dropouts differed significantly from both in-school groups. Mean scores, including those of the few Never-in-school respondents who answered the question, are presented in Table 16. Note that more respondents tend to be satisfied with the education they are receiving than with the college they are attending.

Satisfaction with major/curricular program. CUNY and non-CUNY attenders were most satisfied--equally so--with their CHOICE OF A COLLEGE PROGRAM, while Dropouts were significantly different and least satisfied.

Satisfaction with career goals. Again, more CUNY and non-CUNY attenders were SATISFIED WITH THEIR CAREER GOALS than was the Never-in-school group; Dropouts were intermediate, but again more than "somewhat" satisfied. CUNY attenders and non-CUNY attenders each differ significantly from both Dropouts and the group that was Never-in-school.

Satisfaction with decision to continue school. This item, the degree of satisfaction with the DECISION TO CONTINUE SCHOOLING beyond the high school level, significantly differentiates both CUNY and non-CUNY attenders from both Dropouts and Never-in-school respondents. As expected, the in-school groups were most satisfied, but the others were more than "somewhat" satisfied with their decision (See Table 16, page 44).

Overall, this set of variables distinguishes best between the in-school and the not-in-school groups, and does not discriminate the CUNY attender from enrollees at other schools. In general, those enrolled in some form of educational program tend to more highly value education, have higher educational aspirations, and are more likely to feel

they can accomplish their goals. They also tend to be more satisfied with themselves and the objectives and choices they have made.

CHOICE OF COLLEGE AND CAREER PROGRAM

The next set of variables, listed in Table 17 on the following page, includes Survey and Application items pertaining to the respondents' choice of college and of career program. Many of these items, as can be seen by examining the table, were not statistically significant--that is, did not discriminate among the groups overall. The nonsignificant variables included which college was the respondents' first choice, several specific career programs (e.g., nursing, secretarial studies, engineering), and the more general division between career and non-career programs. Nine of the significant items, discussed below, appeared useful for predictive purposes; the groups' mean scores and standard deviations for these appear in Table 18 (page 49).

As noted in previous studies,[1] the two largest CUNY programs--those enrolling the most students--are secretarial science and the engineering-related technologies; the two smallest, for this sample as well as previous ones, are the health-related technologies and data processing. There are, as would be expected, very low correlations among these career program choices. The highest correlations (among the variables presented in Table 17) are between CUNY CAREER PROGRAM AS FIRST-CHOICE PROGRAM and EDUCATION AS A FIRST-CHOICE PROGRAM ($r = -.61$), and between CUNY CAREER PROGRAM AS FIRST-CHOICE PROGRAM and TWO-YEAR COLLEGE AS FIRST-CHOICE COLLEGE ($r = +.57$). The first, negative relationship indicates that applicants interested in a major in education are unlikely to be interested in a CUNY career program, while the second correlation suggests that those interested a CUNY career program are likely to want a two-year college as their first college choice. We will now examine these variables in greater detail.

CUNY career program as first-choice program. Whether the applicant wanted, as a

---

[1] 1973 Career Graduates, op. cit

TABLE 17

A Listing of Variables Relating to Choice of College and Program: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLE	DATA SOURCE
NS	First-Choice Program: Education	COLLAD
NS	First-Choice Program: Nursing	COLLAD
NS	First-Choice Program: Secretarial Studies	COLLAD
NS	First-Choice Program: Engineering-Technologies	COLLAD
NS	First-Choice Program: Advertising	COLLAD
NS	College Location: Manhattan	Survey
NS	College Location: Bronx	Survey
NS	College Location: Staten Island	Survey
NS	College Location: Out-of-NYC	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*CUNY Career Program as First-Choice Program CUNY vs. non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*First-Choice Program: Accounting Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*First-Choice Program: Health-Related Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school, Dropouts; CUNY vs. non-CUNY	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*First-Choice Program: Data-Processing CUNY vs. non-CUNY, Dropouts; Dropouts vs. Never-in-school	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*First-Choice Program: Business Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school; CUNY vs. non-CUNY	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Career Goals Match CUNY Career Program CUNY vs. non-CUNY, Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*First-Choice College = Two-Year School CUNY vs. non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*College Location: Queens CUNY vs. Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts; CUNY vs. non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*College Location: Brooklyn CUNY vs. non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	Survey

first-choice program, a major that CUNY classifies as a CAREER CURRICULUM significantly distinguishes CUNY attenders from non-CUNY attenders and non-CUNY attenders from the Dropout and the Never-in-school group. The figures in Table 18, below, indicate that 89 percent of non-CUNY college attenders wanted a program offered as a career program option by CUNY, in contrast to 94 percent of CUNY attenders.

TABLE 18

College and Career Programs: Proportion of Students in Each Analytic Group Selecting Specific College- and Career-Related Variables as First Choice

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
CUNY Career Program = 1st Choice Career	N	1612	263	94	182	2151
	%	94	89	96	96	93
	S.D.	±0.24	±0.31	±0.20	±0.21	±0.25
Accounting = 1st Choice	N	1580	252	89	176	2097
	%	12	8	17	8	12
	S.D.	±0.33	±0.28	±0.38	±0.27	±0.32
Business-Related = 1st Choice	N	1580	252	89	176	2097
	%	12	20	18	12	13
	S.D.	±0.32	±0.40	±0.39	±0.33	±0.34
Health-Related = 1st Choice	N	1580	252	89	176	2097
	%	7	12	3	6	7
	S.D.	±0.25	±0.32	±0.18	±0.23	±0.26
Data-Processing = 1st Choice	N	1580	252	89	176	2097
	%	9	5	2	10	8
	S.D.	±0.28	±0.22	±0.15	±0.30	±0.27
CUNY Program Matches 1st Choice Career	N	1569	259	87	158	2073
	%	82	65	64	63	78
	S.D.	±0.39	±0.48	±0.48	±0.48	±0.42
2-yr. College = 1st Choice	N	1612	263	94	182	2151
	%	83	75	88	86	82
	S.D.	±0.38	±0.44	±0.32	±0.35	±0.38
1st Choice Location: Queens	N	1559	257	91	166	2067
	%	29	19	30	19	29
	S.D.	±0.45	±0.39	±0.46	±0.40	±0.44
1st Choice Location: Brooklyn	N	1559	257	91	160	2067
	%	30	19	26	34	29
	S.D.	±0.46	±0.39	±0.44	±0.47	±0.45

Accounting programs. Accounting as the program of first choice significantly differentiates Dropouts from the Never-in-school group and from non-CUNY college attenders. Seventeen percent of the Dropout group chose ACCOUNTING AS A FIRST-CHOICE program, compared with 8 percent of the Never-in-school and non-CUNY attender groups.

Business-related programs. First choice of a BUSINESS-RELATED PROGRAM distinguishes CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school groups from non-CUNY attenders. As shown in Table 18, 20 percent of non-CUNY attenders indicated business as their first-choice program.

Health-related programs (except nursing) as a first-choice differentiates CUNY attenders from non-CUNY attenders, and non-CUNY attenders from Dropouts and from the Never-in-school group. Relatively few respondents in any group expressed interest in HEALTH-RELATED programs, with the largest proportion being 12 percent (non-CUNY attenders).

Data-processing programs. The choice of a DATA-PROCESSING PROGRAM significantly distinguishes CUNY attenders from non-CUNY attenders and from Dropouts; Dropouts were significantly different from the Never-in-school group as well, although very few Dropouts, 2 percent, were interested in this program as a first choice.

CUNY career program matches first-choice career. Respondents were asked to list their first-choice career. Their responses were coded as to whether the ennumerated career was or was not available as a CUNY two-year career program. The choice of a CAREER WHICH MATCHES A CUNY CAREER PROGRAM offering significantly discriminates CUNY attenders from each of the other groups: non-CUNY attenders, Dropouts, and the Never-in-school group. More than 80 percent (82%) of CUNY attenders wanted a career which was available as a CUNY two-year college program. (See Table 18.)

First-choice college is a two-year college. Whether or not the respondents' FIRST-CHOICE COLLEGE WAS A TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION distinguishes among the analytic

groups. Non-CUNY attenders were significantly less likely than all other groups to list a two-year college as their first choice. Table 18 presents the proportion and standard deviation of each group who listed a two-year college as their first choice.

Interestingly, the location of the college of first choice also discriminated among the analytic groups--but only if the college was located in Queens or in Brooklyn, as described below. This may be a function of the fact that allocants to colleges in these boroughs are overrepresented in the respondent group.

College location: Queens. Two CUNY community colleges are located in Queens (Queensborough and LaGuardia), as is Queens and York Colleges, and a large number of non-CUNY schools. Almost 30 percent (29%) of CUNY attenders listed a first-choice college that was located in QUEENS, as compared with 19 percent of the Never-in-school group. The differences are significant for CUNY attenders vs. non-CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school group and between non-CUNY attenders and Dropouts.

College location: Brooklyn. In addition to CUNY's Kingsborough Community College and New York City Technical College in Brooklyn, Medgar Evers offers two-year programs. The borough of Brooklyn also hosts Brooklyn College as well as a large number of non-CUNY postsecondary institutions. Almost one-third (30%) of CUNY attenders listed a Brooklyn-based school as the location of their first-choice college, as did 34 percent of the group that was Never-in-school. A BROOKLYN LOCATION significantly distinguishes CUNY attenders from non-CUNY attenders, and non-CUNY attenders from the Never-in-school group of respondents.

In general, to predict enrollment in CUNY community colleges, applicants who want to go to school in Brooklyn or Queens, who want a two-year college, and who list a major and a career that is classified by CUNY as a career program, are most likely to persist into the second semester of the first year.

COLLEGE AND PROGRAM ALLOCATION

Table 19 (see page 52 and 53) lists the final set of variables--those relating to whether the groups of applicants were allocated to the colleges and programs they chose

and to certain remedial courses. Many of these variables differentiate among the analytic groups and, because they may be useful predictors, will be discussed one-by-one in this section of the report.

Each of these variables was coded Yes or No, and the percentages in Table 20 (which describes selected significant variables) represent the proportion of "yesses." Three variables that only discriminated non-CUNY college attenders from the Never-in-school group will not be considered in any detail--two (average number of courses and average number of credits taken the first semester) because there is no data for the latter group. The third variable, rank of the college of allocation in terms of the applicants' choice, similarly distinguishes only between the Never-in-school group and those who enroll in a non-CUNY college.

TABLE 19

A Listing of Variables Relating to College and Program Allocation: Data Source, Statistical Comparison, and Level of Confidence

STATISTIC/ SIGNIFICANCE	VARIABLE	DATA SOURCE
NS	Allocation to Special Programs	COLLAD
NS	College of Admissions	COLLAD
NS	College of Registration	SHOW-REG
NS	Degree	SHOW-REG
NS, variance sig.	Allocated to Nursing	COLLAD
NS, variance sig.	Allocated to Secretarial Studies	COLLAD
NS, variance sig.	Allocated to Education	COLLAD
NS, variance sig.	Allocated to Engineering	COLLAD
NS, variance sig.	Allocated to Data Processing	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .05$	Choice Number of College of Allocation Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Allocated to First-Choice College Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school, Dropouts; CUNY vs. non-CUNY	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .05$	*Allocated to Accounting CUNY vs. non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	SHOW-REG

TABLE 19 (continued)

ANOVA $\leq .05$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Allocated to Advertising Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts; CUNY vs. Dropouts	SHOW-REG
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Full time/Part time Status	SHOW-REG
$\chi^2 \leq .01$	Day/Evening Session	SHOW-REG
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Allocated to Remedial Courses Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school; CUNY vs. non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	Registered for Desired Courses CUNY vs. Dropouts, non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Allocated to Business Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school; CUNY vs. non-CUNY	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .05$ $t \leq .01$	*Allocated to Health-Related Curricula Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school; CUNY vs. non-CUNY	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Received Financial Aid CUNY vs. Dropouts; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Allocated to First-Choice Cirriculum CUNY vs. non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Never-in-school	COLLAD
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	*Registered for Program Related to Career Goals CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts, Never-in-school	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	Number of First-Semester Courses Dropouts vs. CUNY, non-CUNY	Survey
ANOVA $\leq .01$ $t \leq .01$ $t \leq .01$	Number of First-Semester Credits CUNY vs. non-CUNY; Non-CUNY vs. Dropouts	Survey

Financial aid. Whether or not the respondent reported receiving FINANCIAL AID significantly differentiates the CUNY and non-CUNY attender from the Dropout group. As can be seen in Table 20, on page 55, almost 73 percent of the in-school groups received some sort of financial aid, in marked contrast to only about one-fourth of the Dropouts. Since there is no data for the Never-in-school group for this item, however, this variable cannot be used in a discriminant analysis.

Allocated to first-choice college. Overall, 79 percent of the total sample of respondents were ALLOCATED TO THEIR FIRST-CHOICE COLLEGE. The proportion is greatest for those in the Dropout group, but the significant differences are between the non-CUNY attenders (with the smallest proportion allocated to their first-choice CUNY college) and each of the other analytic groups.

Allocated to first-choice curriculum. The proportion of applicants allocated to the curriculum they desired significantly distinguishes both the CUNY attender and the Never-in-school group from the non-CUNY attender. Non-CUNY college attenders were least likely to be ALLOCATED TO THEIR FIRST-CHOICE CURRICULUM, as can be seen in the proportion of "yesses" in Table 20, page 55.

Curriculum related to career goal. Whether or not applicants' felt that the curriculum to which they were allocated was related to their career goal differentiates the in-school groups from the two groups not (currently) in school. The in-school groups were much more likely to indicate that they were ALLOCATED TO A CURRICULUM RELATED TO THEIR CAREER GOAL.

Allocated to rememdial courses. Respondents indicated whether they were ALLOCATED TO REMEDIAL COURSES and if so, how many and which one(s). The higher the means in Table 20, the greater the number of remedial courses. This item differentiates CUNY attenders from non-CUNY attenders and from the Never-in-school group. Non-CUNY attenders are also significantly different from Dropouts.

The specific curriculum to which respondents were allocated also distinguishes the analytic groups. Education, nursing, secretarial science, engineering-related, and data

TABLE 20

College and Program Allocation: Proportion of Students in Each Analytic Group Who Were Allocated to Selected Colleges and Programs of First Choice[a]

SELECTED SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES		ANALYTIC GROUPS				
		CUNY ATTENDERS	NON-CUNY SCHOOL ATTENDERS	DROP-OUTS	NEVER-IN-SCHOOL	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Received Financial Aid	N	1604	261	85	———	1950
	%	79	78	24	———	76
	S.D.	±0.41	±0.41	±0.43	———	±0.43
Allocated To 1st Choice College	N	1612	263	94	182	2151
	%	80	71	84	81	79
	S.D.	±0.40	±0.45	±0.37	±0.39	±0.41
Allocated To 1st Choice Curriculum	N	1612	263	94	182	2151
	%	89	81	86	90	87
	S.D.	±0.31	±0.39	±0.39	±0.30	±0.31
Curriculum Related To Career Goal	N	1583	257	89	157	2086
	%	86	86	25	16	78
	S.D.	±0.35	±0.35	±0.43	±0.31	±0.41
Allocated To Remedial Courses[a]	N	1535	212	89	93	1929
	$\bar{X}$	4.49	2.90	4.10	3.24	4.24
	S.D.	±2.56	±2.58	±2.73	±2.63	±2.63
Allocated To Accounting Program	N	1585	258	89	176	2108
	%	14	9	18	10	13
	S.D.	±0.34	±0.29	±0.39	±0.30	±0.34
Allocated To Business-Related Programs	N	1585	258	89	176	2108
	%	14	22	16	14	15
	S.D.	±0.35	±0.42	±0.37	±0.34	±0.36
Allocated To Health-Related Curricula	N	1585	258	89	176	2108
	%	7	12	4	3	7
	S.D.	±0.26	±0.32	±0.21	±0.18	±0.26
Allocated To Advertising Curricula	N	1585	258	89	176	2108
	%	7	8	15	10	8
	S.D.	±0.26	±0.27	±0.36	±0.30	±0.27

[a]Mean scores are reported for the item, "Allocated to Remedial Courses".

processing fields--although not significant overall--did have significant variances. Accounting, business, health, and advertising did discriminate among groups.

Accounting. Non-CUNY attenders were least likely to be ALLOCATED TO THE ACCOUNTING curricula. The proportion is significantly different for CUNY attenders vs. non-CUNY attenders and for the non-CUNY attender vs. the Dropout group. (See Table 20.)

Business-related curricula. This variable discriminates among groups. The proportion of respondents ALLOCATED TO BUSINESS-RELATED PROGRAMS of study was significantly different for CUNY (14%) vs. non-CUNY attenders (22%), and for non-CUNY attenders vs. the Never-in-school group (14%).

Health-related curricula. ALLOCATION TO THE HEALTH-RELATED CURRICULA (except for nursing) was most frequent among the non-CUNY attenders. This variable significantly differentiates CUNY from non-CUNY college attenders. In addition, non-CUNY attenders were significantly different from both the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups.

Advertising curricula. The proportion of respondents ALLOCATED TO ADVERTISING CURRICULA distinguishes Dropouts from CUNY and from non-CUNY college attenders. Dropouts had relatively the largest number of respondents assigned to this program of study.

The data pertaining to this final set of variables suggests that lack of financial aid and not being able to register for desired first-semester courses may be factors in the decision of Dropouts to discontinue their schooling. Whether or not the applicant is assigned to a large number of remedial courses also relates to what school she/he will enroll in--as does whether the applicant is assigned to his/her first-choice curriculum. Allocation to an accounting program may also predict whether the student will enroll in a CUNY community college as opposed to other postsecondary educational institutions, as does allocation to the health-related curricula.

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES

One of the objectives of this study was to isolate particular variables which, if measured at the time students were filing college applications, would predict which of those allocated would enroll in the CUNY community colleges. Using the technique of discriminant analysis, we attempted a somewhat different, more detailed type of prediction which considered all four of our analytic groups. Instead of attempting to identify variables which would distinguish between CUNY community college enrollees and non-enrollees (i.e., all others—a classification involving two groups), our analysis aimed at forecasting which of four categories would most likely describe a given allocant: would the allocant attend CUNY community colleges, attend some school other than a CUNY community college, register for a postsecondary educational program but drop out shortly thereafter, or choose not to enroll in any school?

As briefly noted, discriminant analysis is a statistical procedure designed to distinguish between two or more groups. Starting with a collection of variables (in this study, scores and questionnaire items) on which groups are expected to differ, this technique weighs and combines the variables in a manner which forces the groups to be as statistically distinct as possible. In other words, by taking several variables and weighing them and arranging them statistically, this procedure finds a single linear dimension or set of dimensions (called functions) on the most powerful of which the different groups are differentially clustered and in a fashion that groups them as far apart from one another as possible. For each set of variables that are used, the number of functions (linear combinations) that can be derived equals one less than the number of groups of subjects in the configuration. (In our instance, since there are four groups, each combination of variables will result in three linear combinations.)

Variables are selected for inclusion in the discriminant analysis based on their discriminating power: what groups are distinguished by each and how well. Once a set of variables is identified, they are entered into the discriminant analysis; the order of entry is important since after the initial variable, each succeeding one takes into account the discriminating power of those already in. Any final set, as we see below, is of necessity optimal, not maximal, because not every subset or combination of variables is considered.

Once the variables have been selected and the discriminant functions derived, the outcomes in the form of canonical coefficients identify the variables which contribute most to the differentiation of groups along the respective dimension. We can also then use them to classify new cases (subjects) with unknown group membership and/or--as we did in the present investigation--classify the original set of cases to see how many are correctly classified by assigning the case to the group with the highest probability.[1] The ability to classify, that is, predict group membership, is one of the important attributes of this statistical procedure and is also a measure of the adequacy of the derived functions.

Preliminary analyses, variables by category. The discriminant analysis model used in this study involved several stepwise sequences for the purpose of isolating those variables that are best at distinguishing among the four analytic groups. The preceeding section dealt with a total of 179+ variables (scores, questionnaire items) presented for convenience in nine categories. For each, we tested (ANOVAs, chi squares, and t-tests, as appropriate) whether it differentiated between groups and if so, which groups. The 78 variables that distinguish best or that seemed would be most useful in future efforts to predict registration at CUNY community colleges were described in detail. These variables were then entered into preliminary discriminant analyses to further narrow the list of variables to the more powerful; and by keeping categories intact, to test whether any particular category of variables had good predictive accuracy.

Each category of variables was subjected to a discriminant analysis. Table 21 on the following pages, 60 to 63, lists by set, the variables described in the text, and notes those used in the discriminant analyses; the variables are presented in the order in which they were entered. Also included in Table 21 is the sample size for each category which varies according to the pattern of missing (incomplete) data. The final information is a

---

[1] The probability of belonging to a group is derived by comparing the discriminant scores for each individual to the mean discriminant scores for the groups. Misclassifications generally occur in "borderline" cases that don't follow the pattern of the group; they can also occur when the variables are not very good (strong) at distinguishing between the groups. In determining probabilities for the analyses presented herein, the size of each group was taken into account. In other words, the proportion of students that fall into the CUNY attender, non-CUNY attender, Dropout, and Never-in-school categories was incorporated as a condition of "known prior probability."

percentage which shows the proportion of the total sample accurately classified into the four analytic groups.

As can be seen in the table, taken category by category, between 71 percent (DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES) and 76 percent (CHOICE OF COLLEGE AND CAREER PROGRAM) of the sample is classified correctly. That is, each of the individual sets of variables enables us to correctly predict, in about 3 of every 4 cases--or 71 to 76 of every 100 cases, whether the CUNY community college program allocant will enroll in a CUNY community college program and remain in school into the second semester, will enroll in school but drop out prior to the end of the first year, will enroll in a school other than a CUNY community college, or will decide not to engage in additional schooling at the present time.

Although this level of prediction is useful, we attempted to improve on it by using selected variables from all categories. We eliminated some variables which seemed relatively difficult to measure, such as HIGH SCHOOL ACTIVITY INDEX or MOBILITY INDEX. Others were excluded as problematic because, although they discriminate between groups very well in our study, they might not discriminate as well, or in the same manner, if measured at the time of college application--such as HOURS WORKED PER WEEK, or DISSATISFACTION INDEX. In an attempt both to improve the level of prediction and to include only the most suitable variables, other analyses were undertaken and are summarized below.

Final Discriminant Analyses. To arrive at the final set of predictors, which as we will see accurately classifies approximately 80 percent of the sample cases under optimal conditions, we started with all 78 variables considered in the preceding preliminary comparisons by category. By systematically dropping those that did not yield significant ANOVAs and/or t-tests (particularly between CUNY attenders and the other analytic groups), those that had too large a number of missing cases (particularly among the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups), and those that we felt were relatively unsuitable measurements, we ended up with 17 variables, as follows.

The first of this series of progressive analyses used all 78 variables and yielded a

TABLE 21

Summary of Study Variables

Variable Group	Variables	Sample Size	% Correctly Classified in Preliminary Analysis by Category
1. Demographic Variables	-Age* -Hours Worked Per Week*° -Family College History*° -No. of Financial Dependents* -Mobility Index*° -HS Academic Average° -Marital Status°[b] -Attended NYC Vocational HS°	899 Cases: 659 CUNY attenders 144 non-CUNY attenders 31 Dropouts 65 Never-in-school	71.32%
2. Academic Characteristics	-College Admissions Avg.*° -English HS Avg.* -Math HS Avg.* -Science HS Avg.* -Type of HS Diploma*	1839 Cases: 1390 CUNY attenders 245 non-CUNY attenders 79 Dropouts 149 Never-in-school	74.94%
3. NonAcademic Characteristics	-Satisfaction w/Work Preparation* -Satisfaction w/HS Counseling*° -Social Club Membership*° -Used Job Placement Office*° -Volunteer Work*° -Summer/After School Paid Work*° -PSAT/SAT Tests*° -HS Activity Index*°	1102 Cases: 887 CUNY attenders 115 non-CUNY attenders 53 Dropouts 47 Never-in-school	74.94%
4. College Information	-Liberal Arts vs. Career Programs*° -SUNY vs. CUNY Differences*° -AA vs. BA Degree*° -Reported Needing Remediation*° -Expected Remedial Assignments*°	1863 Cases: 1403 CUNY attenders 240 non-CUNY attenders 74 Dropouts 146 Never-in-school	74.08%

TABLE 21 (continued)

5. Reasons for Attending College	-HS Teachers Were Influential* -College's Reputation Was Influential*° -Own Interests Influenced Choice*° -Considered Marriage*° -Considered Taking Time-Off*° -Considered a CUNY 4-yr. College*° -Considered a Non-CUNY 4-yr. College*° -Considered a CUNY 2-yr. College* -Considered a Trade or Technical School*° -Good Job Placement Office Important*° -Caring College Personnel Important*° -Wanted a Formal Degree Program* -Other Schools Require More Work*° -Not Good Enough Grades For Other Schools*° -Easier Courses at This School*° -Tuition Too High at Other School* -Can Work and Go to School*° -This School is Conveniently Located*° -Friends Attend This School*° -Uncertainty About 4-yr. School° -Considered Full Time Work*° -College Advertisements° -Considered Joining Armed Forces°	1440 Cases: 1191 CUNY attenders 202 non-CUNY attenders 33 Dropouts 14 Never-in-school	74.34%
6. Relation Between Education and Jobs & Salaries	-Good Jobs w/a 4-yr. Degree*° -Good Jobs w/an Advanced Degree*° -Good Jobs w/a Professional Degree*° -High Salary w/a GED*° -High Salary w/s HS Diploma*° -High Salary w/an Advanced Degree*°	1863 Cases: 1403 CUNY attenders 240 non-CUNY attenders 74 Dropouts 146 Never-in-school	74.08%

TABLE 21 (continued)

7. Current Attitudes Toward School	-Expected Level of Education*° -Family Expectations: Education* -Likelihood of Completing Education*° -Likelihood of Interrupted Education*° -Likelihood of Working in Chosen Field* -Dissatisfaction Index*° -Satisfaction w/Present School*° -Satisfaction w/Educ.*° -Satisfaction w/Major*° -Satisfaction w/Career Goals*° -Satisfaction w/Deicision to Continue*° -Satisfaction w/Progress Toward Graudation° -Family Expectations: Life Style°	1571 Cases: 1351 CUNY attenders 199 non-CUNY attenders 21 Dropouts 0 Never-in-school	72.62%
8. Choice of College and Career Program	-CUNY Career Program = 1st Choice*° -Accounting = 1st Choice*° -Business-Related = 1st Choice*° -Health-Related = 1st Choice*° -Data-Processing = 1st Choice*° -CUNY Program Matches 1st Choice Career*° 2-yr. College = 1st Choice*° -1st Choice Location: Queens*° -1st Choice Location: Brooklyn*°	1949 Cases: 1491 CUNY attenders 243 non-CUNY attenders 79 Dropouts 136 Never-in-school	75.73%

TABLE 21 (continued)

9. College and Program Allocation	-Received Financial Aid*° -Allocated to 1st Choice College*° -Allocated to 1st Choice Choice Curriculum* -Curriculum Related to Career Goal*° -Allocated to Remedial Courses*° -Allocated to Accounting Program*° -Allocated to Business-Related Programs*° -Allocated to Health-Related Curricula*° -Allocated to Advertising Curricula*° -No. of Credits Taken 1st Semester° -No. of Courses Taken 1st Semester° -Was Able to Take Desired Courses 1st Semester°	1628 Cases: 1418 CUNY attenders 156 non-CUNY attenders 54 Dropouts 0 Never-in-school	74.85%

[a]Key: *Variables described in text (N=78).
°Variables included in preliminary discriminant analysis/by Variable group (N=75).
☐Variables Included in final discriminant analyses (N=17).

pattern of missing values that virtually eliminated all subjects in the Never-in-school group. To compensate, we dropped from consideration those variables with more than 10 percent missing observations.

The 54 remaining variables were then used in the next discriminant analysis, where 18 proved significant at the $\leq$ .05 probability criterion--i.e., 18 where the difference between group centroids were as large or larger than they would be if the population centroids were equal. Adding to the 18 variables others with significance levels of $\leq$ .15 resulted in a total of 27 variables. When these 27 variables were entered into the next analysis, one of the final discriminant analyses, five were lost (were nonsignificant, NS) in the discriminant functions--leaving a total of 22. Three of the 22 variables were then removed because they were either too difficult to compute (MOBILITY INDEX) or were probably influenced by students' post-application experiences (DISSATISFACTION INDEX, HOURS WORKED PER WEEK).

A final discriminant analysis was then run on 19 variables, out of which 17 variables were included in the resultant functions (the remaining 2 proved nonsignificant). This final analysis comprises the remainder of Results. Table 22 on the following page lists the variable names and order of entry. Table 23 on page 66 summarizes the important statistics describing the final analysis which assigns about 80 percent (79.69%) of all respondents to the correct classification. Because we are discriminating among four groups, each discriminant analysis results in three functions; Table 23 also indicates for each function its proportion of variance and overall (average) canonical correlation.

It should be noted that irrespective of the total number of functions generated, the first is always more significant than the second (i.e., has more differentiating power) which, in turn, is always more significant than the third, and so on. On each function, each item or variable yields a standardized canonical correlation which is, roughly, a measure of how strongly that variable correlates with the function. A given value, however, indicates a stronger relationship with group membership when obtained in the first function than when obtained in the second or third. The canonical correlations for each variable in each of the three functions resulting from the final discriminant analysis are summarized in Table 24 on page 67.

TABLE 22

Variables and Order of Entry for Final Discriminant Analysis

VARIABLES	ORDER OF ENTRY
Curriculum Related to Career Goal	1
Reported Needing Remedial Courses	2
Took PSAT/SAT Tests	3
Considered a Four-Year CUNY College	4
Considered Full-time Work	5
Business = 1st Choice Curriculum	6
Number of Financial Dependents	7
(First Choice) College Location: Queens	8
(First Choice) College Location: Brooklyn	9
Career Goal Matches CUNY Career Program	10
Considered a Trade/Technical School	11
College Admissions Average	12
Satisfaction With HS Counseling	13
Knew Difference Between AA/BA Degree	14
Likelihood of Completing Expected Level of Education	15
Knew Difference Between LA/Career Programs	16
Knew SUNY/CUNY Differences	17
Marital Status	NS
Advertising = 1st Choice Curriculum	NS

TABLE 23

Summary Statistics for Final Discriminant Analysis

Statistics:	
Number of Cases, TTL	1310
CUNY attenders	1054
Non-CUNY attenders	165
Dropouts	46
Never-in-school	45
Percent Variance	
Function 1	47.27
Function 2	45.12
Function 3	7.61
Canonical Correlation	
Function 1	.3870
Function 2	.3794
Function 3	.1661
% Respondents Classified Correctly (no missing data): Known prior probability	79.69

TABLE 24

Standardized Canonical Coefficients[a] For Each Variable on Each of Three Functions

VARIABLE	FUNCTIONS		
	1st	2nd	3rd
Curriculum Related to Career Goal	.44	.75	.04
Reported Needing Remedial Courses	.32	.41	.14
Took PSAT/SAT Tests	.25	.13	.07
Considered a Four-Year CUNY College	.35	.22	.05
Considered Full-time Work	.32	.05	.33
Business - 1st Choice Curriculum	.25	.10	.19
Number of Financial Dependents	.07	.19	.50
(First Choice) College Location: Queens	.36	.02	.22
(First Choice) College Location: Brooklyn	.36	.13	.01
Career Goal Matches CUNY Career Program	.18	.14	.21
Considered a Trade/Technical School	.13	.21	.25
College Admissions Average	.25	.01	.22
Satisfaction With HS Counseling	.18	.02	.30
Knew Difference Between AA/BA Degree	.18	.04	.33
Likelihood of Completing Expected Level of Education	.08	.04	.45
Knew Difference Between LA/Career Programs	.22	.18	.12
Knew SUNY/CUNY Differences	.15	.17	.22
Marital Status	---	---	---
Advertising - 1st Choice Curriculum	---	---	---

[a]Coefficient signs (±) have been omitted.

The canonical coefficients for the first and most significant function show that the strongest variable is whether the respondent felt her/his CURRICULUM WAS RELATED TO his/her CAREER GOAL. Four other variables which proved relatively strong are FIRST CHOICE COLLEGE LOCATION: QUEENS; FIRST CHOICE COLLEGE LOCATION: BROOKLYN; CONSIDERED A FOUR-YEAR CUNY COLLEGE; and REPORTED NEEDING REMEDIAL COURSES. (See Table 24, page 67.)

The two strongest variables in the second function are whether CURRICULUM WAS RELATED TO CAREER GOAL and whether the respondent REPORTED NEEDING REMEDIAL COURSES. For the third function, relatively strong correlations are found with NUMBER OF FINANCIAL DEPENDENTS and LIKELIHOOD OF COMPLETING EXPECTED LEVEL OF EDUCATION. Three other variables were also strong although somewhat less so, namely: CONSIDERED FULL-TIME WORK, KNEW DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AA/BA DEGREE, and SATISFACTION WITH HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELING.

- Significant variables, first function. CURRICULUM RELATED TO CAREER GOAL is the single most important variable in the first and most important function. As worded on the Survey, this variable reflects the respondents' opinion of whether the curriculum to which they were allocated matches their first-choice career. As we saw in Table 20 (page 55), those attending school, CUNY community colleges or other postsecondary educational institutions, were much more likely to believe that they had been allocated to a relevant curriculum (86% of both CUNY and non-CUNY attenders) than those who dropped out (Dropouts, 25%) or did not enroll (Never-in-school, 16%). This variable distinguishes each of the in-school groups from each of the groups not currently in school, but does not differentiate the two groups within each school status category. It is important to note in interpreting these findings that, according to OAS records, between 81 and 90 percent of all students were allocated to the curriculum that they ranked first in order of priority (see Table 20) on their application, so that most students are responding about their actual first choice. This indicates, therefore, that most Dropouts and Never-in-school subjects did not feel they were allocated to a relevant curriculum despite the fact that most were allocated to the one they chose. This may be a function of the type of career goals prevalent in these groups, or the clarity of these subjects' career goals at the time they made their curricular choices.

Whether one's CAREER GOAL MATCHES (i.e., is available as) A CUNY TWO-YEAR PROGRAM (Table 18, page 49) was not a strong variable relatively, but seems logically related to whether the allocated CURRICULUM is RELATED TO CAREER GOAL, and is, in fact, moderately correlated with it (r = +.21). This latter variable discriminates between the two school attender groups (as well as between CUNY attenders and each of the two groups not currently in school) and probably contributes to the group differentiation.

The two second-most important variables in the first function are FIRST-CHOICE COLLEGE LOCATION: BROOKLYN and FIRST-CHOICE COLLEGE LOCATION: QUEENS. As can be seen in Table 18, page 49, a greater proportion of CUNY attenders than non-CUNY attenders list first-choice colleges that are located in Brooklyn and Queens, and these differences are significant. A Queens location also discriminated between CUNY attenders and the Never-in-school group (the latter being less likely to prefer this location), and between non-CUNY attenders and Dropouts (many more Dropouts preferring colleges in Queens). A college in Brooklyn is more often a first choice for the Never-in school group than for the non-CUNY attenders.

In general, these comparisons indicate that students who list a first-choice college located in Brooklyn or Queens are more likely to register at the college to which they are allocated. Since more than three-fourths of the students in any group are allocated to their first-choice college, we can postulate that students who choose one of the community colleges in these boroughs are more likely to consider it as a serious option. The large proportion of the Never-in-school group chosing a Brooklyn location, however, suggests one basis for a more targeted recruitment effort.

Another item relatively high on the first function is whether the applicant CONSIDERED A FOUR-YEAR CUNY COLLEGE. Tables 11 and 12, pages 30-31 and 32 respectively, indicate that this variable significantly distinguished the CUNY from the non-CUNY attender and from the Never-in-school subjects. Wanting to attend a four-year CUNY institution was a more serious consideration for the CUNY attender than for any other group.

Whether respondents REPORTED NEEDING REMEDIAL COURSES was another strong variable. As shown in Table 10, page 29, Dropouts and non-CUNY attenders were most likely to indicate that they did not need remediation, while those in the Never-in-school group were most likely to feel they did. Given that the non-CUNY attender group has the highest college admission average, it is logical that relatively few of them would report needing remediation. However, the mean averages for the Dropouts and Never-in-school applicants differ by only one point, which does not explain why many more in the Never-in-school group felt they needed remedial courses. These findings could mean either overly high expectations among students who eventually drop out, insecurity about skills among those who never enroll, or both. Any interpretation is somewhat confounded by respondents' experiences between the time they applied to CUNY and the time they completed the Survey: for example, students (except, of course, those in the Never-in-school group) may have answered the questions about remediation based on whether their school did in fact require them to take remedial classes. It seems reasonable to assume that most respondents answered the question based upon perceptions of their abilities which tend to be relatively stable over time.

The last variable of importance in the first function is whether the respondent CONSIDERED FULL-TIME WORK as an alternative to continuing postsecondary schooling. Proportionately more of the Dropout group (83%) and of the Never-in-school group (88%) considered working full-time than did either the CUNY attender (65%) and non-CUNY attender (54%) groups. This variable discriminated between all groups, except between the Dropout and Never-in-school.

- Significant variables, second and third functions. By far, the two strongest variables in the second function, as in the first, are whether the respondent's CURRICULUM was RELATED TO CAREER GOAL and whether the respondent REPORTED NEEDING REMEDIAL COURSES. These have been discussed.

In the third function, the variable that correlates most highly is NUMBER OF FINANCIAL DEPENDENTS. The vast majority of school attenders have no financial dependents (68% of CUNY, 74% of non-CUNY attender groups), while approximately one-third (34%) of the Dropout group and almost half (49%) of the Never-in-school group have

one dependent. This variable distinguishes between CUNY attenders and both non-CUNY attenders and Dropouts, and also between non-CUNY attenders and both Dropouts and those Never-in-school. Not surprisingly, financial responsibilities play a role in whether one attends and persists in postsecondary educational programs.

The LIKELIHOOD OF COMPLETING EXPECTED LEVEL OF EDUCATION is another highly correlated variable on the third function. It discriminates between all groups except in the comparison between the Dropout and the Never-in-school group. (See Tables 15 and 16, pages 43 and 44, respectively.) More CUNY attenders (59%) and non-CUNY attenders (67%) believe it "very likely" that they will complete their expected level of education than do the Dropout (40%) and the Never-in-school groups (45%).

Once the discriminant functions have been derived and important variables identified, the discriminant analysis can also be used to classify cases. In addition to meeting a primary objective of this study--to identify characteristics of CUNY enrollees--the accuracy of the classification is a check on the adequacy of the derived functions. In other words, by classifying the cases used to derive the functions in the first place, and comparing predicted group membership with actual group membership, one can empirically measure the effectiveness of the discrimination by the proportion of correct classifications.

When the nine categories of variables were considered one-by-one, as we saw they accurately classified between 71 and 76 percent of the subjects. With the subsequent stepwise analysis which employed 17 different variables, we were able to increase the proportion of correctly classified subjects to 80 percent under the condition of prior known probability.

Although overall eight of every 10 subjects (including those with missing data) were classified correctly as members of one or another of the four groups, this final analysis is better at predicting membership in some groups than in others. About 91 percent of actual CUNY attenders were predicted to be CUNY attenders (i.e., were correctly assigned to this group). In contrast, classifications were only 69 percent accurate for the Never-in-school subject; and the accuracy figure decreased to 26 and 24 percent for the Dropout and Non-CUNY attenders, respectively. This tells us, first, that the CUNY attender is the easiest to identify, although this outcome is somewhat influenced by the "known prior probability" where most subjects were CUNY attenders. With respect to the

non-CUNY attender, among whom prediction was poorest, it is important to note that most subjects (70%) were mistaken for CUNY attenders. This confirms the impression that the distinction between the two in-school groups is not great. Among the Dropout group, we also found that many were mistaken for CUNY attenders (41%), while a sizeable proportion were predicted to fall in the Never-in-school group (33%). Thus, the clearest separation exists between CUNY attenders and those Never-in-school; the next most distinctively different contrast appears to be between the in-school subjects and the two groups currently out of school.

DISCUSSION

The data we have presented enables us to describe students who enroll in community college, and to contrast them with others who either chose not to further their education during the 1979-80 year or who dropped out of postsecondary programs shortly after enrolling. Further, we identified certain applicant characteristics which can predict those who enroll in CUNY two-year college career programs. In this section, we will integrate the large amount of data we have available, highlighting those factors that appear most useful for institutional planning and recruitment. First we will discuss the results with respect to predicting enrollment. Then, we will present profiles of the four analytic groups, describing them in terms of what they were like at the time they were applying to college, as well as their situations several months after making their enrollment decisions. In particular, we will compare each of the three other groups to the CUNY community college attender group.

PREDICTING ENROLLMENT

In the latter part of the Results section, we described the discriminant analyses by which we identified characteristics--variables--which predict who among all allocants would enroll in a CUNY community college. By using 17 variables, all of which could be measured at the time students first apply to CUNY, we determined with an 80 percent accuracy rate those allocants who will register at a CUNY community college and continue into the second semester, register but dropout before completing the second

semester, enroll in a postsecondary educational institution other than a CUNY community college, or not continue any postsecondary schooling. Now we will discuss the implications of this predictive potential.

To what extent have we improved on existing institutional capabilities by being able to correctly assign 80 percent of a group of allocants to various subgroups of enrollees/non-enrollees? As a simplified example, let's estimate how accurately we could classify this same group without access to any information about their characteristics, but knowing only the proportions that fall into each group--i.e., having available only the prior known information that about 75 percent of all allocants enroll in a CUNY community college and remain into the second semester, 4 percent enroll but drop out shortly thereafter, 12 percent attend schools other than CUNY community colleges, 9 percent do not enroll in any school. By randomly assigning a given year's allocants to these groups, ensuring that the proper proportion of allocants is assigned to each of them, the chance probability is that approximately 59 percent would be correctly classified.[1] Thus, 80 percent accuracy represents a substantial improvement. Furthermore, this level of accuracy provides administrators with good early estimates of who will enroll, facilitating pre-registration planning.

With respect to measuring the 17 "predicting" variables, five are already incorporated in the existing CUNY application procedures, and are quantified and stored on CUNY's COLLAD tape. These are COLLEGE ADMISSION AVERAGE, whether BUSINESS was an applicants' FIRST-CHOICE CURRICULUM, whether the applicant CONSIDERED A FOUR-YEAR CUNY COLLEGE, and whether the first-choice college location was BROOKLYN or QUEENS. To obtain values for the remaining twelve variables, questionnaire items from the Survey could be adapted and incorporated into the standard CUNY application.

---

[1]This figure is derived as follows: assume we have 100 subjects of whom it is known that 75 percent belong to Group A, 4 percent to Group B, 12 percent to Group C, and 9 percent to Group D. We now randomly classify 75 subjects to Group A, and 4, 12, and 9 subjects to Groups B, C, and D, respectively. Probability tells us that 75 percent of the Group A classifications will be correct (56.25 subjects) as will 4 percent of those for Group B (0.16), 12 percent for Group C (1.44) and 9 percent for Group D (0.81). Summing these correct assignments, 58.66 of the subjects or about 59 percent of them will be classified--by chance--as members of the groups to which they actually belong.

We should emphasize at this point that when future predictions are made using the same variables we identified, the level of predictive accuracy will probably be somewhat different from what we report. This is because, by necessity, our Survey data was collected approximately one year after students filed their applications to CUNY. While we cannot guarantee that their intervening experiences did not influence their responses, we attemped to allow for this by including in the final discriminant procedure those variables which should not have been substantially affected by the passage of time.

As an alternative to using this set of predictors, however, those categorized as CHOICE OF COLLEGE AND CAREER PROGRAM could be employed. This would not necessitate adding any items to the existing application form and, since this set of variables does not involve student perceptions, should yield the same predictive capability we reported. The level of accuracy, however, at 76 percent, is somewhat lower than for our final 17-variable discriminant analysis.

How much insight do the strongest of the 17 predictor variable give us into the differences among the analytic groups? The statistical technique itself uses variables that, taken together, classify students into four groups. Any one of the final list of variables by itself does not necessarily discriminate better between any two groups than variables not included in the discriminant analysis because all four group differences are taken into account by that statistical procedure.

Indeed, the different variables in the final list have diverse values in the classification process, in that they distinguish between the groups in different ways. Whether a student was allocated to a CURRICULUM RELATED TO CAREER GOALS, for example, tended to discriminate between the groups currently in school or not: CUNY and non-CUNY attenders more often had curricula and career goals than were related than did allocants in the other two groups. Having a FIRST-CHOICE COLLEGE LOCATION in QUEENS, on the other hand, was generally more indicative of a CUNY attender or Dropout than of a person who never registered for postsecondary schooling. Whether students REPORTED NEEDING REMEDIATION distinguished between all group; Never-in-school subjects perceived this need the most, followed in order by CUNY attenders, Dropouts, and non-CUNY attenders.

While the variables pinpoint dimensions on which the four groups are most differentiated from one another overall, they do not necessarily represent the most useful summary of the data for purposes other than prediction. Of more potential utility, for

example, is a description of each group with special attention to the similarities and differences between that group and the CUNY attender. In other words, for recruitment efforts it would be important to examine how students currently not being served by CUNY compare with those who do enroll in community college and persist through the first half of their freshman year. Such information can suggest reasons why students choose to attend or alternatively, whether more would enroll in CUNY community colleges given modified recruitment efforts or revisions or expansions in programs or services. The remainder of the discussion profiles the four analytic groups, focusing on what we believe are the most meaningful differences between groups for purposes of long-term planning.

CUNY (COMMUNITY COLLEGE) ATTENDER GROUP PROFILE

CUNY community college attenders appear to be a college-oriented group, with the majority expecting to obtain at least a two-year but more probably a four-year college degree. A reasonable proportion expect to complete a master's degree and virtually none have educational aspirations that end with completion of high school or technical training. Most consider the probability high that they will, in fact, attain their academic aspirations.

The majority of CUNY attenders were allocated to their first-choice college and, moreover, they were very likely to have a career goal that matched the community colleges' program offerings. In spite of this, most considered a CUNY four-year college as a serious option after they graduated from high school, and placed a high value on four-year and advanced degrees for obtaining good jobs and high salaries. Few seriously considered the alternative of attending private college, which is consistent with the finding that only a small proportion took the PSAT or SAT tests. The majority of CUNY attenders comtemplated working full-time as an alternative to entering college, although few sought help from their high school job placement offices. Marriage and just "taking time off" were also considerations for many of these students.

In terms of academic ability, the group's college admission average was 74, and most students fell within 6 points of this mean. About three quarters of the students were required to take at least one remedial course, with math the most probable. About 60 percent of CUNY attenders earned academic diplomas; about 12 percent earned the GED.

In making their schooling decisions, CUNY attenders indicated that they did not

receive adequate assistance from their high school counselors. Fewer than half were satisfied with the counseling they received. Their choice of college was guided not so much by teacher or counselor recommendations as by their own interests, the school's location, and whether or not they had friends who went there. Moderately influential in their choice was the cost of tuition, and consistent with this concern, 79 percent of this group reported receiving some form of financial aid. As might be expected, CUNY attenders are very familiar with the differences between CUNY liberal arts and career programs--information directly related to their program decision. They are less familiar with aspects of the State system--SUNY/CUNY differences.

The average age of the newly enrolled CUNY community college attender is 21, and the large majority is unmarried with no financial dependents. There is a sizable minority who do have dependents, however, and of those who do, more are likely to have just one. As a group, CUNY attenders are not highly mobile: they tend to live, work, and go to school in the same borough. As compared with the other analytic groups, this group contains disproportionately more students whose first-choice college was one located in Brooklyn or Queens.

Assessed midway into their freshman year, CUNY attenders are generally satisfied with their academic situation and optimistic about the future. They tend to be happy with their college and happier still about their major. Most are pleased with their decision to continue their education and feel it is likely that they will attain the highest educational level they desire. There is, in general, satisfaction with their career goals as well.

The CUNY attender works an average of 9.6 hours per week, somewhat less than a typical part-time job. Interestingly, their jobs tend <u>not</u> to be related to their career goals. Because they have few dependents and most receive financial aid, this suggests that they work primarily to meet day-to-day living expenses.

NON-CUNY ATTENDER GROUP PROFILE

College attenders enrolled in postsecondary educational programs other than in the CUNY community colleges differ from the CUNY attender more by degree than character. They are very similar to the CUNY two-year college student in that both groups are strongly differentiated from the not-in-school groups (the Dropout and the Never-in-school groups); in many respects, however, the non-CUNY attender also differs from the CUNY attender.

By definition, all non-CUNY attenders are enrolled in some postsecondary institution other than a CUNY community college. The institutions they attend, however, vary substantially. Approximately 57 percent are enrolled in a four-year college, 16 percent in a two-year college, 23 percent in a trade or technical school, while the remaining 4 percent reported a variety of other miscellaneous training programs. Despite the fact that all of these respondents chose not to attend the CUNY community college to which they were allocated, about 71 percent of them had been assigned to their first choice. Moreover, approximately 81 percent were allocated to the curriculum of their first choice. The proportions allocated to first-choice college and curriculum are significantly smaller than the corresponding figures for the CUNY attender group, suggesting on the one hand that this may have been a factor in their decision not to enroll in a CUNY community college. However, on the other hand, it is likely that for at least some of them, the CUNY two-year schools did not offer what they felt was the most appropriate program of study, despite the priorities they noted on their CUNY application.

The non-CUNY attender is younger than his/her CUNY counterpart: the average age for this group is 19. They also have fewer dependents. Like CUNY attenders, they are not the first-generation college go-er in their family, but they are somewhat more likely to number college graduates among close family members. Non-CUNY attenders are the most mobile of any group, but this may be a function of some attending postsecondary institutions that are located out of the City.

Non-CUNY attenders had statistically higher (and less variable) college admission averages, but the difference in scores was quite small: the mean for this group was 76 as compared to 74 for the CUNY attender. The academic averages for non-CUNY attenders in English, math, and science were also higher than for the CUNY attender, and fewer in this group (64%) felt they would have needed remedial courses had they enrolled in a CUNY community college.

Similar to the CUNY attender, most of the students in the non-CUNY group do not expect their education to end with two years of college: they expect to receive a four-year credential and, of all groups, they are most likely to aspire to a master's degree as well. As a group, non-CUNY attenders are even more confident than are CUNY attenders that they will attain their educational goals. In terms of their career goals, it is interesting that considerably fewer students stated goals that were directly related to

available CUNY community college career programs--about 65 percent as compared to 85 percent of CUNY attenders. This is probably one explanation of why the CUNY community colleges proved less attractive an option for many non-CUNY attenders than did the institutions that they chose to attend.

Like the CUNY attender, non-CUNY students are relatively, but even more dissatisfied with the counseling they received in high school. In choosing a college, their own interests tended to be the strongest influence, but compared to their CUNY counterparts, they were more concerned about a school's reputation and less concerned about convenient locations and about having friends who went there. Non-CUNY attenders reported knowing less about the difference between liberal arts and career programs at the community colleges than did CUNY attenders at the time they were applying to college, but they reported knowing more about SUNY/CUNY differences. In contrast to CUNY attenders, the non-CUNY attender less seriously considered a CUNY four-year college or a CUNY two-year college as options, and more gave consideration to non-CUNY colleges and to trade and technical schools. Most non-CUNY attenders took PSATs or SATs. In general, the non-CUNY attender more seriously considered all educationally-related options than they did other alternatives such as marriage and time off. As a group, non-CUNY attenders considered working full time less seriously than did CUNY attenders, although about half the students did consider this possibility.

At the midpoint of their freshman year, non-CUNY attenders have very similar feelings about their decisions as did CUNY attenders. The non-CUNY students tend to be satisfied with their school and their major, as well as with the career goals they have set. Many also work, with the average number of hours worked per week (11) not significantly different than that for the CUNY attender group.

In general, it appears that students who chose educational options other than the CUNY community colleges to which they were allocated did so after considering a range of alternatives, and with at least as much information at their disposal as had CUNY attenders. The non-CUNY attenders are comparatively strong academically, are oriented towards higher education, and are generally satisfied with their choice of school and program. As compared to CUNY attenders, fewer students in this group have career goals that match CUNY community college career programs, a condition which may have played a substantial role in their schooling decision.

One factor which may influence non-CUNY attenders to enroll in a CUNY

community college would be an increase in the proportion allocated to the college and curriculum of their first choice; however, since the majority were so allocated, it is questionable how large a number would have reconsidered. Another, probably more variable attraction would be expanded program offerings in line with the career goals of this group of students. It would require further study to identify the specific content, duration, or scheduling of such programs, assuming that this type of expansion is feasible to begin with.

DROPOUT GROUP PROFILE

With respect to academic background, those students who enrolled in a postsecondary educational program but dropped out shortly thereafter are virtually indistinguishable from those who persisted. On other dimensions--particularly demographic characteristics, financial concerns, and present outlook--the groups are quite different.

No statistical difference was found between the college admission averages of Dropouts and CUNY attenders. Similarly, the proportions of students feeling they needed remedial courses was also not significantly different. Approximately equal numbers of Dropouts and CUNY attenders had earned GEDs, and while somewhat more CUNY attenders obtained academic diplomas, this difference was not significant. The educational aspirations of the Dropouts indicate that they intend to complete at least two years of postsecondary education. Dropouts are less likely to feel that four-year or advanced degrees are necessary for obtaining good jobs.

In terms of personal characteristics, Dropouts tend to be older--23 was the average age as compared to 21 for the CUNY attenders. Dropouts have more dependents, averaging 1.3 per subject, and are more likely to be married. As is true for the CUNY attenders, Dropouts are not a mobile group with respect to where they live, attend school, and work.

Looking back to the time they were first applying to college, Dropouts reported that they knew a moderate amount about liberal arts versus career programs, SUNY/CUNY differences, and the differences between associate and baccalaureate programs. They are similar to CUNY attenders in this respect. As a group, they express more concern about tuition and about being able to work while attending classes; this is not surprising given

the fact that they have more financial dependents. Dropouts are also more likely to seriously consider working full-time or attending trade or technical schools as alternatives to going to a CUNY community college.

There was no statistical difference between Dropouts and CUNY attenders in the proportion allocated to the CUNY community college of their first choice or to their first-choice curriculum. There was a very large difference, however, in the proportion who felt that the curriculum to which they were allocated matched their career goals: whereas about 82 percent of the CUNY attenders felt this to be true, only about 25 percent of the Dropouts believed there was a relationship. Three possible interpretations are that the Dropouts were not very sure of their career goals at the time they filed their CUNY choices, that their goals changed subsequently, or that their career goals are not directly related to any community college curriculum to begin with and they made do with the best program choices available.

Another interesting difference between the CUNY attender and the Dropout group is in the proportion reporting that they received financial aid for college; this was the case for about 79 percent of the CUNY attenders but for only 24 percent of the Dropouts. This difference may contribute to, or perhaps explain to some degree, Dropouts' concern about the cost of tuition and working while in school. It is possible that many persons in this group were on the borderline of eligibility for financial aid, and that not receiving it influenced their decision to discontinue their education.

Several months after beginning and dropping out of a postsecondary school, students tend to be less satisfied with their educational and career situations than students who continue. They tend to be only somewhat satisfied with their career goals and indicate that it only somewhat likely that they would complete their desired level of education. Most Dropouts were working at the time of the Survey, and the average number of hours worked per week was 26.

The major differences between the CUNY attender and the Dropout group appear to be in their financial obligations and their clarity about how education can help to attain career goals. Most Dropouts expect to continue with postsecondary education, however, so one can presume that a number of these students would consider returning to CUNY. If so, they will need assistance in determining which programs best suit their long-term plans, and in working out financial arrangements.

NEVER-IN-SCHOOL GROUP PROFILE

The Never-in-school group, consisting of allocants to the CUNY community colleges who do not enroll in any school, appear to have more poorly defined goals than CUNY attenders. On many dimensions, however, the two groups are similar. Although the Never-in-school group is weaker academically and has relatively modest educational aspirations, on these factors the differences between them and CUNY attenders are quite small.

The average age for the Never-in-school subject is 21, comparable to the CUNY attender. No statistical difference is found in the number of dependents, nor in the degree of mobility exhibited by the CUNY attender and the Never-in-school group. In terms of personal characteristics, the one differentiating variable is that the subjects in the Never-in-school group are less likely to report college graduates among their family members.

The Never-in-school group had a lower mean college admission average although, at 72, the average is only two points different from that of the CUNY attender. Similar proportions of subjects in both groups received academic high school diplomas, and about equal percentages earned GEDs. Had the Never-in-school subjects enrolled in a CUNY community college, a greater number felt they would have had to take remedial courses (84% as compared to 75% of CUNY attenders), but this difference was not statistically significant.

The Never-in-school group appeared to have been more work-oriented in high school than were CUNY attenders. They were more likely to have done volunteer work and to have had jobs after school. They also reported a greater degree of satisfaction with the work preparation they received in high school, although no difference was found between the groups in the proportion making use of high school job placement offices.

In formulating their plans for post-high school work or education, the Never-in-school subjects considered a variety of options more seriously than did the CUNY attenders: taking time off, attending a CUNY community college, enrolling in a trade or technical school, and working full time. They were less likely than the CUNY attender, however, to consider a CUNY four-year college. When asked about factors important in selecting a school, the Never-in-school group rated most items as less than "somewhat" important, including location, having friends at the school, and cost of tuition. Their perceptions about how much they knew about CUNY/SUNY differences and liberal

arts/career program differences did not differ from the perceptions of CUNY attenders, but the Never-in-school respondents felt that they knew less about the differences between associate and baccalaureate degree programs.

The educational aspirations of the Never-in-school group are lower than those of CUNY attenders, although many expect to complete two years of college and some intend to go still further. Fewer of the Never-in-school subjects than CUNY attenders report that their families expect them to obtain some college credits, although a majority indicated that this is the case. It is probably at least partially significant in their decision not to enroll in school that the Never-in-school group sees less connection between higher education and better or higher paying jobs.

There was no difference in the proportions of the Never-in-school and CUNY attender groups allocated to the CUNY college and curriculum of their first choice. to reiterate, these proportions were high: 81 percent of the Never-in-school group and 80 percent of the CUNY attender group were allocated to the college of first choice; 90 percent of the Never-in-school subjects and 89 percent of CUNY attenders recieved their first-choice curriculum. Similar to the Dropout group, however, very few Never-in-school respondents felt that the program to which they were allocated was related to their career goal--only 16 percent saw such a relationship as compared to 25 percent and 86 percent of the Dropouts and CUNY attenders, respectively. As with the Dropout, the typical Never-in-school subject has a desire for higher education and tends to be allocated to their first-choice program, but indicates that this would not necessarily help in a career. It would appear that what for them would be optimal educational programs were not available, or more likely, that they were unsure of how best to use available higher educational opportunities to further their career plans.

The Never-in-school group, while different in many ways from the CUNY attender group, represents potential college enrollees. Somewhat weaker academically, the grades of the Never-in-school group were not far below those of CUNY attenders. And while they aspire to less education generally, most indicated a desire for at least some college. These students did not voice the financial concerns noted among the Dropout group, so in this regard, college is a possibility. What they may require is a clarification of their goals and an orientation to what type of education would be most helpful.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During the 1979-80 school year, the CASE Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education undertook a study of enrollees--new entrants into the City University of New York's community college career programs. The purpose of this investigation, which was supported by the Bureau of Grants Administration of the New York State Education Department with VEA funds, was to contrast the characteristics of allocated students who enroll in CUNY programs with those allocants who do not show up for registration. Knowledge of the critical, distinguishing characteristics of these groups should permit administrators and policy makers, both within and outside of the CUNY system, to make more informed decisions about program offerings, support services, and recruitment policies.

Through its central Office of Admission Services (OAS), CUNY community colleges process applications from many thousands of persons who will not enroll in a CUNY two-year program of study. In any one year, OAS estimates that one out of four--25 percent--of students assigned to a community college career program will not, in fact, enroll. Some, it was suspected, would enroll in other colleges, universities, and training programs, while others would elect not to continue their schooling at that point in time. To be able to predict in advance of registration which students will or will not enroll, and to tailor services to the allocant, should impact positively on student retention and rate of graduation. Furthermore, a better understanding of the characteristics of allocants who choose not to enroll should suggest new recruitment strategies or on-campus supports for many potential students who, in fact, might benefit from CUNY's two-year occupational programs.

The study described in the body of the report examined the salient characteristics of students who were allocated to the CUNY community college career programs in the Fall of 1979. A random sample of approximately 7,000 persons was drawn by social security number, comprising one-quarter of the year's allocations. The final sample included 6749 allocants to all CUNY community colleges (except for Hostos Community College), of whom 4246 were designated by the colleges as having enrolled and 2503 designated as no-shows--that is, did not register for classes in the Fall of 1979.

Basic demographic and academic data about the sample were obtained from the CUNY application form and this was supplemented by a specially-prepared questionnaire sent out in January 1980--during the second semester of the sample's first year in college. The questionnaire asked for information pertaining to the students' educational history, non-educational high school experiences, career plans and expectations, and current schooling and work activities. There were also some demographic questions about family background and financial aid and some attitudinal ones concerning reasons for attending college.

A followup mailing to nonrespendents, or a telephone followup, resulted in a response rate of 32 percent, with a substantially greater proportion of enrollees than non-enrollees responding; the results of the telephone followup procedure were dramatic, again especially among enrollees where half of those contacted responded positively. The greater interest of CUNY students to a CUNY-presented study is not surprising, however, and can be interpreted as interest in their education and with the colleges they are attending.

The final questionnaire sample consisted of 2151 persons, 74.9 percent of whom were enrolled at the community college to which they had been allocated. There were an additional 4.4 percent (94) who had started but had since dropped out of college, and 8.5 percent (182) who had not attended at all. About 12 percent (12.2% or 263) indicated they were attending other postsecondary educational institutions--including four-year non-CUNY colleges--SUNY colleges (92), trade or technical schools (60), and CUNY four-year colleges (43). These four groups, the enrollee or CUNY community college attender, the non-two-year CUNY school attender or the non-CUNY attender, the Dropout, and the nonattender or Never-in-school group comprise the four analytic groups for this study; unfortunately too small Ns did not allow us to keep separate the subgroups included in the non-CUNY attender group. Note that of the persons considered by CUNY as non-enrollees at the community colleges (i.e., all groups except the CUNY attender), 61 percent actually started college or some other form of postsecondary schooling.

The four analytic groups were examined with respect to the study's variables, both those based on the CUNY application form and those from the questionnaire. The 179+ variables, irrespective of their source, were grouped into nine categories: (1) DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, (2) ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS, (3) NONACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS, (4) COLLEGE INFORMATION, (5) REASONS FOR ATTENDING

COLLEGE, (6) RELATION BETWEEN EDUCATION AND JOBS AND SALARY, (7) CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL, (8) CHOICE OF COLLEGE AND CAREER PROGRAM, and (9) COLLEGE AND PROGRAM ALLOCATION.

The statistical technique of discriminant analysis was employed to meet one of the study's objectives: namely, to identify those variables which would best predict whether a given student would enroll in a CUNY community college, enroll in a postsecondary institution other than a CUNY community college, enroll in school but drop out by the second semester, or opt not to enroll in any educational program.

Separate discriminant analyses were run for each of the nine categories of variables. The most successful of these analysis, by virtue of simplicity, replicability, and predictive ability, was that which considered the set of CHOICE OF COLLEGE AND CAREER PROGRAM variables. This particular category consisted only of items from the standard CUNY application, or items easily derived from it, and accurately classified 76 percent of the sample into the four analytic groups. In other words, by analyzing selected applicant data (the variables in this category), administrators can ascertain with 76 percent accuracy which students will enroll in the CUNY community college to which they are allocated and which will fall into the other three groups--and this analysis can be undertaken in advance of registration.

In an attempt to improve this level of prediction, the most meaningful variables from the nine categories were entered into another series of discriminant analyses--beginning with 78 variables and systematically excluding those that did not yield significant differences, those that had too large a number of missing cases, and those that we felt to be relatively cumbersome to measure. The final discriminant analysis used 17 variables and correctly classified 80 percent of the cases into the four analytic groups.

As indicated by the canonical coefficients, which are--roughly--measures of how well the individual variables correlated with the discriminant function, the strongest variables in the final discriminant analysis were: (1) whether an applicant felt the curriculum to which she/he was allocated (and this was most often the curriculum of first choice) was related to his/her career goal; (2) whether the applicant's first-choice college was located in Brooklyn or Queens; (3) whether a CUNY four-year college was a serious consideration; and (4) whether the applicant felt that she/he needed remedial courses. Some of these variables as well as others in the final analysis are already part of the standard CUNY application; others are not but could be added to it readily.

Thus, by employing selected information that is accessible from the CUNY application form, predictions about enrollment can be made with 76 percent accuracy; using a set of 17 variables, some of which would require items to be added to the application, increases the accuracy of prediction to approximately 80 percent. The most viable course to pursue is a matter of judgment, since the latter method results in higher accuracy, but requires more preparation. Moreover, we have some concern that if items are added to the application, they may yield slightly different values (and hence somewhat different predictive power) than what we observed, because of the timing of our data collection. Whichever set of predictors is considered, however, administrators could determine with a high degree of certainty and well in advance of registration who is likely to enroll. This, in turn, would give them more lead time to plan services for the incoming students.

Although the discriminant analyses provided useful formulations for predicting enrollment, they did not constitue the study's sole meaningful findings. Profiles were presented of the four analytic groups, emphasizing similarities and differences between the CUNY attenders and those who exercised other options.

The inter-group comparisons indicated that despite some striking differences among the four groups, all represent potential populations that might benefit from participation in career programs. Virtually all allocants, regardless of whether they are currently in school or what school they attend, aspire to two or more years of college. Furthermore, despite statistically significant differences, the four groups of allocants did not differ substantially in terms of academic achievement. What then determines whether and where an allocant will enroll? And what are the implications for recruitment, support services, and program offerings?

In-school groups. Differences between those who chose to enroll in CUNY community colleges and those who opted for other schools or colleges were not many, although non-CUNY community college attenders tended to be somewhat younger, slightly better academically, and more geographically mobile. Most students currently in any type of postsecondary school had no financial dependents and tended not to voice strong economic concerns. Generally, students in both in-school groups (CUNY attenders and non-CUNY attenders) had educational aspirations that go beyond two years of college, and most were confident that they would meet their educational goals.

Whereas the groups reported having had somewhat different information at their

disposal at the time they made their college applications (CUNY attenders knew more about community college career/liberal arts options; non-CUNY attenders knew more about SUNY/CUNY differences), both in-school groups reported dissatisfaction with the college and career counseling they had received in high school. Their schooling choices may have been different had more or better information been available to them: since the two groups are so similar in many respects, one could hypothesize that some students who chose CUNY community colleges would have enrolled in school elsewhere, and vice versa.

Although most students in both groups were allocated to the CUNY college and curriculum of their first choice, the proportion was lower for those who chose other schools than for CUNY attenders (71% of non-CUNY attenders were allocated to their first-choice college and 81% their to first-choice curriculum; the corresponding figures for CUNY attenders were 80% and 89%, respectively). It is quite likely that had more non-CUNY attenders received their first choice(s), more would have enrolled in CUNY community colleges; given the high proportion whose choices were granted, however, it is questionable how substantial the difference would have been. There was a larger discrepancy between the two in-school groups in the proportion of students whose career goals matched a community college career program -- there was a match for 85 percent of CUNY attenders but for only 65 percent of the non-CUNY attenders. This, then, may have been more of a contributing factor in the decision of many students.

It appears that both students who chose to attend CUNY community colleges and those who chose other educational options did so relatively free from financial obligation, after having considered a number of alternatives, and with serious intention of obtaining at least one formal college degree. With the exception of providing CUNY applicants with as much information about CUNY and non-CUNY options as possible, there are few group differences suggesting needed modifications in either recruitment or program planning. Both groups would have wanted more help applying to college, which calls for an upgrading of informational services, particularly in the high schools. Two factors of importance in the decision of whether to enroll in a CUNY community college or elsewhere (allocation to college and curriculum of first choice, and whether one's career goal matches a specific CUNY career program) are currently being addressed. The CUNY allocation process atempts to allocate as many applicants as possible to their first choice(s). The investigation of additional programmatic offerings by community colleges, however, might be intensified.

Groups not (currently) in schools. An examination of the characteristics of allocants who were not in school at the time of our Survey--either because they dropped out shortly after enrolling or because they never began--suggests that many of these people may have chosen or persisted in a CUNY community college program had certain conditions been different. Moreover, since they indicated relative dissatisfaction with their subsequent educational and career decisions, they represent a group of persons who might profit substantially from enrolling in a two-year college program.

Students who began postsecondary educational programs but dropped out differ from CUNY attenders primarily in terms of financial obligations and in the clarity of their schooling and career goals. There was little difference among groups in such things as academic qualifications, reported knowledge about college characteristics, or in the proportions of students allocated to their first-choice CUNY college and career program. Although the educational aspirations of Dropouts are somewhat less ambitious than those of CUNY attenders, most indicated a desire to complete at least two years of postsecondary education. After dropping out of school, they tended to report less satisfaction with their educational and career decisions than those who continued in school, and most were working almost full time.

Dropouts were, on the average, older than CUNY attenders and had more financial dependents. Consistent with this, they expressed more concern about the cost of college tuition and the need to work while in school. Interestingly, far fewer Dropouts reported having received financial aid for college.

With respect to educational and career goals, there was evidence of some confusion or indecision among the Dropout group. Whereas most were allocated to the CUNY curriculum of first choice, and indicated a desire for two years of college, only about one quarter of this group felt that the curriculum to which they were allocated was related to their career goal. This suggests that the relationship between education and work is still unclear to many, particularly with respect to which programs (if any) meet their needs. It is possible that initial confusion or a change in direction subsequent to the time they applied to college contributed to their decision to drop out of the educational programs in which they enrolled.

It seems likely that Dropouts would have benefitted from more career and decision-making help when first applying to college, and could still use this type of assistance. Since most students in this group are working, they might take advantage of an evening

session program devoted to self-assessment and goal assessment. Also of importance would be assistance in locating sources of financial aid that might permit them to reapply to and remain in college. They might be more likely to persist had they access to additional on-campus support in terms of class scheduling, child care arrangements, and part-time work opportunities.

Those students who elected not to enroll in any school (Never-in-school) did not have the same financial concerns as the Dropout group. They tended to be similar to CUNY attenders in age, marital status, and number of financial dependents, but most elected to work as the alternative to continuing their education.

The Never-in-school allocants were the poorest academically, although their mean college admission average was only two points lower than that of CUNY attenders. They demonstrated more concern about the adequacy of their preparation for college, however, as evidenced by the large proportion who felt they would need remedial help. Nonetheless, it is clear that many students with academic qualifications similar to those of the typical Never-in-school subject succeed very well in school. Two-year programs aimed at this group might stress the colleges' range of support services and offer them more sheltered opportunities for learning in their first year.

Like the Dropouts, the Never-in-school respondent demonstrated the same uncertainty or indecision with respect to coordinating educational and career goals. Most desired at least some college education, most were allocated to the CUNY curriculum of their first choice--yet few acknowledged any relationship between this curriculum and their career goal. It appears that this group too might benefit from programs or workshops which explore various aspects of career decision making and self-assessment.

To summarize, our findings indicate that:

- Approximately 75 percent of those students allocated to CUNY community colleges enroll and persist into their second semester.
- Of those allocants who do not enroll in CUNY community colleges, approximately half (12% of all allocants) attend some other postsecondary educational institution. The other allocants either start an educational program and dropout within several months (4%) or do not enroll in any school (9%).
- It is possible to predict well before registration, on the basis of relatively few variables, which allocants will enroll and persist, enroll and drop out by the

second semester, enroll in a postsecondary institution other than a CUNY community college, or not continue their education. Predictions can be made with approximately 80 percent accuracy.

- Students who enroll in the CUNY community college to which they are allocated are similar in many respects to students who enroll in other schools. Both groups indicate a high degree of satisfaction with their current schools and majors, although both groups expressed relative dissatisfaction with the counseling received in high school.
- Allocants not currently in school (students who drop out of school shortly after enrolling and allocants who do not enroll in any school) nevertheless tend to aspire to at least two years of college. Respondents in these two groups are relatively dissatisfied with, and indecisive about, their educational/career goals. Thus, both groups represent potential community college students.
- Students who drop out of school soon after enrolling tend to be older and have more financial concerns than respondents in any other group, but they do not differ from the CUNY community college attender in academic achievement.
- Allocants who do not enroll in any school are poorest academically, although their high school academic indices are not very much lower than those of students enrolled in CUNY community colleges. In spite of this relatively small difference, those who chose not to go to college or other postsecondary program appear considerably less confident about their preparation for college.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Survey of Community College Freshmen.....A1
Survey of Recent High School Graduates.....A7

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

CASE: Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education

The Graduate School and University Center

City University of New York

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FRESHMEN

GENERAL BACKGROUND

1.

FOR EACH ITEM BELOW, CHECK ONE COLUMN AT THE RIGHT:	Queens	Man-hattan	Bronx	B'klyn	Staten Island	Other; Specify
Where was the high school from which you graduated?						
Where did you live when you graduated from high school?						
Where is the school you go to now?						
Where is the school to which you applied as your first-choice?						
Where do you live now?						
If you are now working, where do you work?						

2. How long does it usually take you to make a one-way trip to the school in which you are enrolled? _____hours and _____minutes.

3. How much does a one-way trip cost? _____dollars and _____cents.

4. How do you usually get to school? (Check one.)
☐ Car ☐ Walk or bike ☐ Subway or bus ☐ Railroad

5. With whom do you live?
☐ Alone ☐ With friends ☐ With parents ☐ With spouse ☐ With relatives

6. Are you now working at a paid job? ☐ No ☐ Yes; if yes, answer a-f below.
a. What kind of work do you do? _____
b. Is your job related to the career of your choice? ☐ No ☐ Yes
c. Is your job related to your school program? ☐ No ☐ Yes
d. Do you work: ☐ full-time? or ☐ part-time?
e. In an average week, about how many hours do you work? _____number of hours a week.
f. Are you working mainly for: ☐ experience? ☐ money? ☐ fun? ☐ other?

7. Including yourself, how many dependents do you support financially? (Enter a number; use a "0" if you are supported by someone else, such as parents or spouse.)
_____dependents.

8. Are you now receiving any form of student loan, financial assistance, or scholarship?
☐ None ☐ Personal loan ☐ Bank loan ☐ BEOG
☐ Co-op ☐ Work-study ☐ NDSL ☐ TAP

9. All things considered, how likely is it that family or financial obligations might cause you to drop out of school either permanently or temporarily?
☐ Very likely ☐ Somewhat likely ☐ Somewhat unlikely ☐ Very unlikely

10. Please indicate who in your family has or is now attending, and who completed college.

FAMILY MEMBER WHO:	Attended or is Attending	Completed College	Not Applicable
Spouse (wife or husband)			
Father			
Mother			
Brother(s)			
Sister(s)			
Children			
Aunts, uncles, cousins			
None of these			

11. Are you: ☐ Married? ☐ Single? ☐ Separated/divorced? ☐ Widowed?

EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

12. Check to indicate which of the things you did while you were in high school.

	YES	NO
Use the school or public library regularly?		
Belong to a social, religious, or political club or organization?		
Take a course at a school other than your regular school?		
Actively participate in school sports?		
Ask to speak to a guidance counselor or advisor?		
Use the school's job placement office?		
Work on the school newspaper, magazine, or yearbook?		
Work for a school organization?		
Have friends who went (or go) to your community college?		
Have friends with the same career interest that you have?		
Have friends who "dropped out"?		
Do volunteer work?		
Have an after-school or summer job(s)?		
Take the SAT's or PSAT's?		
Graduate from high school between June 1978 and September 1979?		

13. Knowing what you know now, if you were just making a decision about what you would do after you graduated from high school, what would you choose? (Check only one.)

- ☐ The same school I am attending
- ☐ Another community college
- ☐ A four-year college
- ☐ A trade or technical school
- ☐ No school, just take a break
- ☐ No school, work for a while to earn some money
- ☐ No school, work for a while to get some experience
- ☐ Other; specify: _____

14. Looking back at your high school experience, are you satisfied with:

	YES	NO
The emphasis on basic academic subjects?		
The emphasis on vocational and technical subjects?		
How much and how hard you studied?		
The grades you got in your courses?		
How well high school prepared you for college?		
What you learned in high school?		
How good a student you were?		
The counseling and advice you received?		
How well high school prepared you for work?		

15. The following items concern people or experiences that you might have had that influenced your decision to continue your schooling. For each item on the list below, rate how much influence the person or event had on your decision.

AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE:	Very much	Some	None at all
A college representative who came to my high school			
Knowing someone who went (or goes) to your college			
Recommendation by a high school counselor			
Recommendation by a high school teacher			
Knowing about the school's reputation			
Suggested by a member of my family			
My own interests			
An ad on radio, T.V., or in a newspaper			
No special reason			
Other; specify:_____			

16. Below is a list of some things people do after they graduate from high school. For each item, rate how seriously you considered it as an alternative to college.

I CONSIDERED IT:	Very Seriously	Some-what	Not at all
Going to a four-year college in CUNY			
Going to a non-CUNY four-year college			
Going to another CUNY community college			
Going to a trade or technical school			
Going to work full-time			
Going to work part-time			
Joining the armed services			
Getting married and not working and not going to school immediately			
Taking time off and not doing anything			
Other; specify:_____			

17. Please indicate how much you knew about each of the items on the list below at the time you were applying to college.

WHEN I WAS APPLYING TO COLLEGE, I KNEW:	A Lot	Some	Almost Nothing
The differences between the State University (SUNY) and the City University of New York (CUNY)			
The differences between an associate and a bachelor's degree			
Tuition differences for freshmen at a 2-year college and a 4-year college			
The differences between liberal arts and career programs at a community college			
The assignment of students to basic skills or remedial courses based on placement tests			
The differences between 2-year college career programs and trade or technical school programs			
The differences between full-time and part-time schooling			
The differences between attending day and evening sessions			
The differences between public and private colleges			
Financial assistance and the differences among the various financial aid packages			

18. How much education do you expect to complete? (Check one.)

- ☐ High school diploma
- ☐ Some college, no degree
- ☐ Technical training, no degree
- ☐ A community college degree
- ☐ A four-year college degree
- ☐ A professional degree (M.D.,D.D.S.)
- ☐ A master's degree
- ☐ A doctorate degree
- ☐ Other; specify:_____

19. How likely do you think it is that you will actually complete the level of education you indicated in the question above?

☐ Not likely ☐ Somewhat unlikely ☐ Somewhat likely ☐ Very likely

20. If your schooling is interrupted, do you think you would return to school in the future? ☐ No ☐ Yes

21. For someone of your sex, what are the usual expectations in your family? (Check one.)

- ☐ Attend college, graduate, and then go to work
- ☐ Graduate from college, work for a while, and then have a family
- ☐ Go right to work after you graduate from high school
- ☐ Have a family right after graduating from high school
- ☐ Marry after high school, and neither go to work nor to school
- ☐ Go to work in the family business
- ☐ Other; please specify:_____

CAREER PLANS

22. Please write the name of the career or occupation you would most like to have after you have completed all the schooling you want. Then, answer a-d about that career.

First-choice occupation or career: _____

a. Are you now enrolled in a program that leads to that career? ☐ No ☐ Yes

b. Have you any paid or unpaid work experience related to that career? ☐ No ☐ Yes

c. How sure are you that that is the career or occupation you really want?
☐ Very unsure ☐ Somewhat unsure ☐ Pretty sure ☐ Very sure

d. How likely are you to get a job in that career when you finish your education?
☐ Not likely ☐ Somewhat unlikely ☐ Somewhat likely ☐ Very likely

23. We are interested in your opinion about how people with different educational backgrounds do in the job market -- in terms of getting a good job and earning a high salary. For each of the kinds of educational backgrounds listed below, indicate whether you think few, some, or many people get a good job and whether few, some, or many earn high salaries.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:	GOOD JOBS			HIGH SALARY		
	Few	Some	Many	Few	Some	Many
GED (High School Equivalency)						
High school diploma						
2-year college liberal arts graduate						
2-year college career program graduate						
Trade or technical school graduate						
4-year college graduate						
Armed services training graduate						
Master's degree or doctorate						
Professional degree (doctor, lawyer)						

CURRENT SCHOOLING

24. In your first college semester (or quarter), how many different courses did you take?
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 or more

25. In your first semester (or quarter), how many credits did you take? ____ credits.

26. In your first semester (or quarter), were you able to register for all or nearly all the courses you wanted? ☐ Yes ☐ No; please explain why not: _____

_____

27. As a result of the placement tests you took before you enrolled in college, were you required to take any make-up, basic skills, or remedial courses in college? (Check all that apply.)

☐ No ☐ Yes, in reading ☐ Yes, in writing ☐ Yes, in mathematics

28. How did you feel about being assigned to take these make-up, basic skills, or remedial courses?

I FELT THAT:	YES	NO
I could really use the help		
I didn't really need them		
I was embarrassed taking them		
I didn't think they were effective		
I was annoyed by the extra work		
I didn't expect to have to take any		

29. For each statement below, check to show how true it is for you.

	Very true	Somewhat true	Not true at all
I chose this school because I wanted a specific career			
I chose this school for other reasons, not for career considerations			
My friends were going (or had gone) to this school			
Some of my relatives went (or go) to this school			
I wasn't sure I wanted to go to school for four years			
I thought other schools would require too much work and study			
My grades were not good enough to get into other schools			
Courses here are easier than at other schools			
I couldn't afford the tuition at other schools			
This school lets me work enough time to support myself (and my family)			
This school is more convenient for traveling than others			
This school has counselors to help me with decisions			
This school offers good job placement services			
People here really care about what happens to me			

30. For each of the following items, check to show how satisfied you are.

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH:	Very	Some-what	Not very
The school you are attending?			
The education you are receiving?			
Your choice of program and major?			
Your present career (job) goals?			
Your decision to continue school?			
How well you are doing in school?			
Passing your courses and graduating on time?			

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

CASE: Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education

The Graduate School and University Center

City University of New York

SURVEY OF RECENT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

GENERAL BACKGROUND

1.

FOR EACH ITEM, CHECK ONE COLUMN AT THE RIGHT:	Queens	Man-hattan	Bronx	B'klyn	Staten Island	Other; Specify
Where was the high school from which you graduated?						
Where did you live when you graduated from high school?						
If you are going to school now, where is the school located?						
Where is the school to which you applied as your first-choice?						
Where do you live now?						
If you are now working, where do you work?						

2. If you are now going to school, how long does it usually take you to make a one-way trip to school? _____hours and _____minutes.

3. If you are now going to school, how much does a one-way trip cost? _____dollars _____cents.

4. How do you usually get to school? (Check one.)
☐ Car ☐ Walk or bike ☐ Subway or bus ☐ Railroad ☐ Not in school

5. With whom do you live?
☐ Alone ☐ With friends ☐ With parents ☐ With spouse ☐ Relatives

6. Are you now working at a paid job? ☐ No ☐ Yes; if yes, answer a-f below.
a. What kind of work do you do? _____
b. Is your job related to the career of your choice? ☐ No ☐ Yes
c. Is your job related to what you are studying in school? ☐ No ☐ Yes
d. Do you work: ☐ full-time? or ☐ part-time?
e. In an average week, about how many hours do you work? _____number of hours a week.
f. Are you working mainly for: ☐ experience? ☐ money? ☐ fun? ☐ other?

7. Including yourself, how many dependents do you support financially? (Enter a number; use a "0" if you are supported by someone else, such as parents or spouse.) _____dependents.

8. Are you now receiving any form of student loan, financial assistance, or scholarship?
☐ None ☐ Personal loan ☐ Bank loan ☐ BEOG
☐ Co-op ☐ Work-study ☐ NDSL ☐ TAP

9. All things considered, how likely is it that family or financial obligations might cause you to drop out of school either permanently or temporarily? Check here if you are not now in school because of family or financial obligations: ☐
☐ Very likely ☐ Somewnat likely ☐ Somewhat unlikely ☐ Very unlikely

10. Please indicate who in your family has or is now attending, and who completed college.

FAMILY MEMBER WHO:	Attended or is attending	Completed College	Not Applicable
Spouse (wife or husband)			
Father			
Mother			
Brother(s)			
Sister(s)			
Children			
Aunts, uncles, cousins			
None of these			

11. Are you: ☐ Married? ☐ Single? ☐ Separated/divorced? ☐ Widowed?

EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

12. Check to indicate which of the things you did while you were in high school?

	YES	NO
Use the school or public library regularly?		
Belong to a social, religious, or political club or organization?		
Take a course at a school other than your regular school?		
Actively participate in school sports?		
Use the school's job placement office?		
Work on the school newspaper, magazine, or yearbook?		
Work for a school organization?		
Have friends who went (or go) to the school you are attending?		
Have friends with the same career interest that you have?		
Have friends who "dropped out"?		
Do volunteer work?		
Have an after-school or summer job(s)?		
Take the SAT's or PSAT's?		
Graduate from high school between June 1978 and September 1979?		

13. Knowing what you know now, if you were just making a decision about what you would do after you graduated from high school, what would you choose? (Check only one.)

- ☐ The same school I am attending
- ☐ A community college
- ☐ A four-year college
- ☐ A trade or technical school
- ☐ No school, just take a break
- ☐ No school, work for a while to earn some money
- ☐ No school, work for a while to get some experience
- ☐ Other; specify: _____

14. Looking back at your high school experience, are you satisfied with:

	YES	NO
The emphasis on basic academic subjects?		
The emphasis on vocational and technical subjects?		
How much and how hard you studied?		
The grades you got in your courses?		
How well high school prepared you for additional schooling?		
What you learned in high school?		
How good a student you were?		
The counseling and advice you received?		
How well high school prepared you for work?		

15. The following items concern people or experiences that you might have had that influenced your decision to continue your schooling. If you continued your education after high school, rate how much influence the persons or events on the list below had on your decision.

AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE:	Very Much	Some	None at all
A school representative who came to my high school			
Knowing someone who went (or goes) to my school			
Recommendation by a high school counselor			
Recommendation by a high school teacher			
Knowing about the school's reputation			
Suggested by a member of my family			
My own interests			
An ad on radio, T.V., or in a newspaper			
No special reason			
Other; specify:_____			

16. Below is a list of some things people do after they graduate from high school. For each item, rate how seriously you considered it as an alternative to what you are doing now.

I CONSIDERED IT:	Very Seriously	Somewhat	Not at all
Going to a(nother) four-year college in CUNY			
Going to a(nother) non-CUNY four-year college			
Going to a(nother) CUNY community college			
Going to a(nother) trade or technical school			
Going to work full-time			
Going to work part-time			
Joining the armed services			
Getting married and not working and not going to school immediately			
Taking time off and not doing anything			
Other; specify:_____			

17. Please indicate how much you knew about each of the items on the list below at the time you were graduating from high school

WHEN I WAS GRADUATING FROM HIGH SCHOOL, I KNEW:	A Lot	Some	Almost Nothing
The differences between the State University (SUNY) and the City University of New York (CUNY)			
The differences between an associate and a bachelor's degree			
Tuition differences for freshmen at a 2-year college and a 4-year college			
The differences between liberal arts and career programs at a community college			
The assignment of CUNY students to basic skills or remedial courses based on placement tests			
The differences between 2-year college career programs and trade or technical school programs			
The differences between full-time and part-time schooling			
The differences between attending day and evening sessions			
The differences between public and private colleges			
Financial assistance and the differences among the various financial aid packages			

18. How much education do you expect to complete? (Check one.)

- ☐ High school diploma
- ☐ Some college, no degree
- ☐ Technical training, no degree
- ☐ A community college degree
- ☐ A four-year college degree
- ☐ A professional degree (M.D.,D.D.S.)
- ☐ A master's degree
- ☐ A doctorate degree
- ☐ Other; specify:_____

19. How likely do you think it is that you will actually complete the level of education you indicated in the question above?

☐ Not likely ☐ Somewhat unlikely ☐ Somewhat likely ☐ Very likely

20. If you continued schooling after graduating from high school, and your schooling was interrupted, do you think you might return to school in the future? ☐ No ☐ Yes

21. For someone of your sex, what are the usual expectations in your family? (Check one.)

- ☐ Attend college, graduate, and then go to work
- ☐ Graduate from college, work for a while, and then have a family
- ☐ Go right to work after you graduate from high school
- ☐ Have a family right after graduating from high school
- ☐ Marry after high school, and neither go to work nor to school
- ☐ Go to work in the family business
- ☐ Other; please specify:_____

CAREER PLANS

22. Please write the name of the career or occupation you would most like to have after you have completed all the schooling you want. Then answer a-d about that career.

First-choice occupation or career: _____

a. Are you in an educational program that leads to that career? ☐ No ☐ Yes

b. Have you any paid or unpaid work experience related to that career? ☐ No ☐ Yes

c. How sure are you that that is the career or occupation you really want?

☐ Very unsure ☐ Somewhat unsure ☐ Pretty sure ☐ Very sure

d. How likely are you to get a job in that career when you finish your education?

☐ Not likely ☐ Somewhat unlikely ☐ Somewhat likely ☐ Very likely

23. We are interested in your opinion about how people with different educational backgrounds do in the job market -- in terms of getting a good job and earning a high salary. For each of the kinds of educational backgrounds listed below, indicate whether you think few, some, or many people get a good job and whether few, some or many earn high salaries.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:	GOOD JOBS			HIGH SALARY		
	Few	Some	Many	Few	Some	Many
GED (High School Equivalency)						
High school diploma						
2-year college liberal arts graduate						
2-year college career program graduate						
Trade or technical school graduate						
4-year college graduate						
Armed services training graduate						
Master's degree or doctorate						
Professional degree (lawyer, doctor)						

CURRENT SCHOOLING

24. What college or training institution are you currently attending? _____

_____ Check here if you are not now in school: ☐

Check here if you started and then dropped out after high school: ☐

25. If you went (or go) to school after graduating from high school, how many different courses did you take in the first term, semester, or quarter?

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 or more

26. How many credits did you take in the first semester or quarter? _____ no. of credits.

27. If you continued schooling after high school, were you able to register for all or nearly all the courses you wanted in the first semester, term, or quarter?

☐ Yes ☐ No; please explain why not: _____

28. If you applied to a CUNY college, you were required to take a placement test whether or not you enrolled. As a result of these tests, were you assigned to take any make-up, basic skills, or remedial courses? (Check all that apply.)

☐ No ☐ Yes, in reading ☐ Yes, in writing ☐ Yes, in mathematics

29. How did you feel about being assigned to take these make-up, basic skills, or remedial courses?

I FELT THAT:	YES	NO
I could really use the help		
I didn't really need them		
I was embarrassed taking them		
I didn't think they were effective		
I was annoyed by the extra work		
I didn't expect to have to take any		

30. If you are currently enrolled in a school of any kind, check to show how true each of the following statements is for you.

	Very true	Somewhat true	Not true at all
I chose this school because I wanted a specific career			
I chose this school for other reasons, not for career considerations			
My friends were going (or had gone) to this school			
Some of my relatives went (or go) to this school			
I wasn't sure I wanted to go to a 4-year school			
I wasn't sure I wanted to go to a 2-year school			
I wasn't sure I wanted to go through a formal degree program			
I thought other schools would require too much work and study			
My grades were not good enough to get into other schools			
Courses here are easier than at other schools			
I couldn't afford the tuition at other schools			
This school lets me work enough time to support myself (and my family)			
This school is more convenient for traveling than others			
This school has counselors to help me with decisions			
This school offers good job placement services			
People here really care about what happens to me			

31. For each item below, check to show how satisfied you are.

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH:	Very	Some-what	Not Very	Not Applicable
The school you are attending?				
The education you are receiving?				
Your choice of program and major?				
Your present career (job) goals?				
Your decision to continue school?				
How well you are doing in school?				
Passing your courses and graduating on time?				
Your present job?				

MAR 26 1982

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
RE 36